	Page 1
1	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	Case No. 18-235328-rdd
4	Adv. Case No. 19-08286-rdd
5	x
6	In the Matter of:
7	
8	SEARS HOLDINGS CORPORATION
9	
10	Debtor.
11	x
12	SAYVILLE MENLO LLC
13	Plaintiff,
14	v.
15	TRANSFORM HOLDCO LLC ET AL
16	Defendants.
17	x
18	
19	United States Bankruptcy Court
20	300 Quarropas Street, Room 248
21	White Plains, NY 10601
22	
23	December 10, 2020
24	10:04 AM
25	

Page 3 1 HEARING re Notice of Agenda of Matters Scheduled for 2 Telephonic Hearing on December 10, 2020 at 10:00 a.m. 3 HEARING re Final Fee Application of Deloitte & Touche LLP 4 5 for Compensation for Services Rendered and Reimbursement of 6 Expenses Incurred as Independent Auditor and Advisor for the 7 period: 10/15/2018 to 10/31/201 9, fee:\$2,476,936.00, 8 expenses: \$47,154.66 (ECF #9016) 9 10 Adversary proceeding: 19-08286-rdd Sayville Menlo LLC v. 11 Transform Holdco LLC et al HEARING re Motion to Approve / Defendants Motion to Enforce 12 13 Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants Motion 14 to Dismiss the Amended Complaint with Prejudice (ECF #25) 15 16 Adversary proceeding: 19-08286-rdd Sayville Menlo LLC v. 17 Transform Holdco LLC et al 18 HEARING re Opposition Brief (related document(s)25) filed by 19 Anthony J D'Artiglio on behalf of Sayville Menlo LLC. (ECF 20 #30) 21 22 Adversary proceeding: 19-08286-rdd Sayville Menlo LLC v. Transform Holdco LLC et al 23 24 HEARING re Order signed on I /9/2020 Granting in Part and 25 Denying in Part Defendant's Motion to Dismiss the Amended

Page 4 Adversary Proceeding (Related Doc# 14) (ECF #23) Adversary proceeding: 19-08286-rdd Sayville Menlo LLC v. Transform Holdco LLC et al HEARING re So Ordered Stipulation and Scheduling Order Signed on 11/12/2020 Concerning the Defendant's Motion to Enforce (ECF #29) Transcribed by: Sonya Ledanski Hyde

	1930170
	Page 5
1	APPEARANCES:
2	
3	ANSELL GRIMM & AARON
4	Attorney for Sayville Menlo, LLC
5	365 Rifle Camp Road
6	Woodland Park, NJ 07424
7	
8	BY: JOSHUA BAUCHNER (TELEPHONICALLY)
9	
10	CLEARY GOTTLIEB STEEN & HAMILTON LLP
11	Attorneys for Transform Holdco
12	One Liberty Plaza
13	New York, NY 10006
14	
15	BY: LUKE BAREFOOT (TELEPHONICALLY)
16	SAMUEL LEVANDER (TELEPHONICALLY)
17	
18	WEIL GOTSHAL & MANGES
19	Attorneys for Debtors
20	767 Fifth Avenue
21	New York, NY 10153
22	
23	BY: JACQUELINE MARCUS
2 4	JENNIFER CROZIER
25	JARED FRIEDMANN

Page 6 DELOITTE AND TOUCHE Independent Auditor and Accounting Advisor for Debtor 30 Rockefeller Plaza, 41st Floor New York, NY 10112 BY: RONALD YOUNG ALSO APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY: PAUL HARNER, Fee examiner TOBAY DALUZ

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good morning. This is Judge Drain.

We're here on a Sears omnibus day. This hearing is

completely telephonic. You should identify yourself and

your client, therefore, the first time that you speak. It's

also a good idea to do that thereafter, so that the court

reporter can put together your voice with your name.

There's one authorized recording of today's hearings. It's taken by Court Solutions. If you want to order a transcript of your matter, you should contact our clerk's office to arrange for the production of one. Court Solutions provides a copy of the recording to clerk's office on a daily basis.

Because these hearings are all on a telephonic basis, you should keep yourself on mute unless you speak, at which point, of course, you should unmute yourself.

So, with that introduction, I have the revised agenda that came in this morning. I'm happy to go down that; although, I'm happy to take any sort of initial report as well if the Debtors' counsel wants to make one.

MS. MARCUS: Good morning, Your Honor. Jacqueline
Marcus, Weil Gotshal & Manges on behalf of the Debtors.

Actually, we didn't prepare any formal remarks today, so we were just going to go right into the agenda, which, as you know, based on the amended agenda, is rather

short. The first matter on the agenda is the final fee application of Deloitte and Touche, and Mr. Roland Young from Deloitte will address the Court regarding that matter.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. YOUNG: Good morning, Your Honor, Roland
Young, in-house counsel for Deloitte, representing Deloitte
and Touche. Deloitte and Touche was retained as the
independent auditor and accounting advisor in this case,
performed services from the inception of the case through
October 31st, 2019. In the final fee application, Deloitte
and Touche requested fees of \$2,476,936 and expenses of
\$47,154.66. We did have extensive interaction with the fee
examiner throughout the case, and in the final fee
application, we noted a reduction of \$125,000 related to the
-- primarily the fees in the first interim fee application.

Subsequent to the filing of the final fee application, we had further interaction with the fee examiner and agreed to an additional reduction, which is not reflected on the fee application itself of \$10,000 and those relate primarily to the fees which are relatively modest in the second and third interim fee application.

We have -- I have circulated a proposed order to
the fee examiner and to Debtors' counsel and once
everybody's signed on that -- off on that, would propose to
submit it to chambers for Your Honor. Please let me know if

there's any questions you might have regarding the fees.

THE COURT: Okay. And I'm assuming that no other developments then, the additional reduction that you just mentioned.

MR. YOUNG: That's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Did anyone else have anything to say on the Deloitte final fee application?

MR. HARNER: Your Honor, very briefly. Good
morning. It's Paul Harner as the fee examiner. Just to -for the Court's information, first of all, Mr. Young's
summary is absolutely correct. That does reflect agreement
with the fee examiner after review of the various interim
applications and the final application, and I would also
just note for the Court's information, that Mr. Young and
his colleagues were very quickly responsive, not only to our
formal preliminary reports, but to our various concerns, and
the matters were easily resolved, so we appreciate their
cooperation. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Very well. All right. I have reviewed the final application and also during the course of the case dealt with the interim applications. The vast bulk of Deloitte's fees are for audit services. Given the role of the fee examiner in this case and my review of the application, I will grant the application, which is unopposed, in the revised amount sought. Any issues I

Page 10 could've had on most of the work are well subsumed within 1 2 the \$125,000 agreed reduction. 3 I did have some question about sort of the dribs and drabs of the last period, but I think those are dealt 4 5 with by the additional agreed reduction of \$10,000. So, 6 counsel for Deloitte can email chambers the proposed order 7 with Schedules A and B laying out the interim and final 8 awards in those schedules. You don't need --9 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: -- settle that on any -- you don't 11 need to formally settle that on anyone, but you should copy 12 Mr. Harner and Debtors' counsel when you send it, when you 13 email to chambers. 14 MR. YOUNG: Very good. Will do. Thank you, Your 15 Honor. 16 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. 17 MR. HARNER: With that, Your Honor, may Ms. Daluz 18 and I be excused, please? 19 THE COURT: Yes. That's fine. 20 MS. DALUZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 MR. HARNER: Thank you, Your Honor. 22 MR. YOUNG: I'll plan to hang up as well. 23 you again. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MS. MARCUS: Jacqueline Marcus again, Your Honor.

Page 11 1 The next matter and the last matter, actually, is a matter 2 involving an adversary proceeding between Sayville Menlo, 3 LLC and Transform Holdco. That will be handled by Mr. Barefoot from Cleary, and Your Honor, I'd request that a 4 5 number of the Weil attorneys who are on this phone be 6 permitted to leave the call, since it doesn't affect the 7 Debtors. 8 THE COURT: Sure, that's fine. 9 MS. MARCUS: Thank you. 10 MR. BAREFOOT: Good morning, Your Honor. Luke 11 Barefoot from Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen, and Hamilton, LLP on 12 behalf of Transform Operating Stores. 13 THE COURT: Morning. 14 MR. BAUCHNER: And Good morning, Your Honor. Joshua Bauchner with Ansell, Grimm, and Aaron on behalf of 15 16 Sayville Menlo, LLC. 17 THE COURT: Morning. 18 MR. BAREFOOT: -- Barefoot from Cleary for Transform. I just wanted to note as a housekeeping matter 19 20 that literally about one moment ago, I just saw a 21 supplemental or corrected memorandum of law filed in this 22 matter by Sayville. I haven't had an opportunity to review that, and so won't really be prepared at this hearing to 23 24 comment on that or what has changed in that, and would 25 propose --

Page 12 1 THE COURT: Well, with that, is that in addition 2 to the objection? 3 MR. BAREFOOT: Your Honor, it appears to be a corrected version of the objection that was filed, but I 4 5 can't readily tell what has changed in the pleading that was 6 just filed. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Bauchner --8 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor --9 THE COURT: -- is it just a correction for typos 10 and things of the objection? 11 MR. BAUCHNER: Exactly, Your Honor. To be 12 precise, on Page 13, the first sentence of Section 3 was 13 omitted. It's an introductory sentence. It's just to make sure the record is clear. We apologize. We just discovered 14 15 it this morning in preparation for the hearing, but it 16 doesn't materially change anything here. We just wanted to 17 18 THE COURT: Okay. MR. BAUCHNER: -- add that introductory sentence 19 20 so that the record was clear. But no --21 THE COURT: Okay. Very well. 22 MR. BAUCHNER: -- other significant moment. 23 you. 24 THE COURT: All right. MR. BAREFOOT: Your Honor, Luke Barefoot from 25

Cleary for Transform again. Subject to Your Honor's preference, I'd propose to proceed with a brief introductory argument and turn it over to Sayville. THE COURT: All right. I mean, you both can assume that I've reviewed Transform's motion, Sayville's objection, and Transform's reply, as well as the underlying order that's at issue with regard to this motion, which is my order, dated January 9, 2020, the transcript of the December hearing that led to that order, and Mr. D'Artiglio's letter to Justice Jamieson which I think prompted the filing of this motion, which is dated October 28, 2020. I've reviewed the other exhibits, too, but I view those as the primary documents relevant to today's motion. MR. BAREFOOT: Understood, Your Honor, and I will try to be as brief as possible, with that in mind. THE COURT: Okay. MR. BAREFOOT: Your Honor, Luke Barefoot again from Cleary. We're here this morning on the adversary

proceeding captioned Sayville Menlo v. Transform Operating

Stores, LLC, Case No. 19-08286.

On Transform's motion to enforce the January 2020 order dismissing with prejudice claims against Transform that arose prior to the assumption and assignment, based on Transform -- Sayville's failure to file an objection in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

response to the cure notice as was required by this Court's bidding procedures order.

I just want to emphasize that the relief that

Transform is seeking requires no factual determinations by

this Court, and only requires the Court to confirm what we

believe are the plain terms of the dismissal order, the

bidding procedures order, and Section 365 to prevent

Sayville's efforts to evade and collaterally attack the

dismissal order.

As the record reflects, Your Honor, since the time of the dismissal order, the parties have recommenced the state court litigation in accordance with the Court's directions, but Sayville has advanced there, pursuant to the letter to judge -- Justice Jamieson that Your Honor referenced, what we believe is an untenable reading of the dismissal order, under which, the only claims that would be barred are those that the landlord specifically and formally noticed as defaults prior to assumption and assignment.

That reading is at odds with the terms of the bidding procedures order, the record of the proceedings before this Court on the motion to dismiss, and the purpose and structure of 365. Specifically, the landlord's interpretation would allow this landlord and other landlords to remain silent and lie in wait to assert claims against buyers in contravention of the protections of bidding

procedures orders.

Very briefly, Your Honor, at base, the landlord's core contention on the interpretation of the dismissal order is refuted simply by reading the Court's rationale, articulated from the bench, as to why it was granting the motion to dismiss as to unasserted, pre-assignment defaults.

If you go to the transcript of the December 13th, 2019 hearing at 161 Line 2, the Court reasoned: "I believe that the landlord is now time barred to assert a claim for damages or for specific performance, since the specific performance can be quantified for breach of contract for anything that could be said to be owing, either as a fixed or unliquidated amount, i.e., necessary (sound drops) make the claimed repairs pre-assignment."

The Court went on to say, at Page 161, 14 to 18:

"I'm going to grant the motion to dismiss with respect to

the contract claim for those pre-assignment amounts that

could have been asserted, either as a liquidated amount or

an amount that could be described and on a liquidated

basis."

It's important to note that the Court's rationale turned on amounts that could have been asserted, not amounts that were asserted or that could have said to be owing, not amounts that had been asserted. Nowhere did the Court's rationale examine or turn on the terms of the lease, the

mechanism for noticing defaults under the lease, if any, or whether a default was formally noticed. We believe this is consistent with the decisions we cited in our papers of other Courts that specifically reject contract counterparties' efforts to employ this kind of a lie-in-wait tactic.

Turning to the landlord's assertion that the dismissal order's text itself supports its interpretation, they focus on the fact that the dismissal order refers to defaults under the lease. First, it's important, Your Honor, that the term default there is lower case, undefined.

Moreover, the reference to defaults under the lease serves only to specify the source of the obligations, not to create a loophole where defaults that weren't noticed prior to assignment somehow were outside of the bidding procedures order.

If you look at Paragraph 4 of the dismissal order, it puts to rest any interpretation that the landlord is now asserting. It specifically holds that to the extent that any repairs are required under the lease, all pre-assumption costs shall be the sole responsibility of the plaintiff, notwithstanding anything in the least to the contrary. So, the terms of the order specifically refute any suggestion that the terms and mechanisms of the lease, rather than the mechanisms of the bidding procedures order, governed.

Finally, Your Honor, the fact that the order does not expressly reference Section 365 of the Code does nothing to change this. This is particularly the case where the dismissal order is itself based on an interpretation and enforcement of the bidding procedures order, which, by its expressed terms, was entered pursuant to the authority under Section 365.

Your Honor, I'll just respond very briefly to the other contentions that the landlord raises in its opposition papers. First, Your Honor, the landlord asserts that to enter the order that Transform is request, would interfere with the state court's jurisdiction, but this Court's dismissal order expressly retains jurisdiction to interpret and enforce its own order, and this is particularly important, Your Honor, where the dismissal order itself is based on an interpretation of this Court's own bidding procedures order.

While Transform is understandably reluctant to burden this Court's docket, it was necessitated to avoid plaintiff's efforts to evade or undermine the dismissal order through collateral attacks in the state court.

Second, Your Honor, to the extent that the plaintiff argues that Transform is judicially estopped from arguing that certain defaults, in fact, arose prepetition, they ignore the standard for judicial estoppel as well as

the procedural posture of the dismissal order, which arose on a motion to dismiss. Of course, on a motion to dismiss, Transform was required to accept the allegations in the complaint as true, and can't be estopped from contesting those allegations later when the facts educed in discovery suggest otherwise.

The Court also never adopted or took any position on the allegations, given the procedural posture of a motion to dismiss. The Court's colloquy at the hearing also made express that the allegations were not the limit. If you look again at the transcript of the dismissal hearing, Page 151, Line 16, the Court expressly said, "And that number isn't the cap on what is the landlord's. If Transform can show that, you know, in addition, these other costs were there, pre-assignment, then that would be the landlord's, too, because they weren't asserted."

Third, Your Honor, plaintiff's allegations of what they call fraud on the Court not only lack evidence, but they're simply neither here nor there, in terms of the issue that's before the Court, which is the terms of the dismissal order. They focus specifically on a deposition of a representative witness of Transform.

First, many of the inconsistencies that they point to are between positions of the Debtors and positions of Transform, which are distinct entities, and Transform has

been found not to be a successor of the Debtors. And at base, all testimony amounts to is simply some shreds of evidence that would support plaintiff's claims that default did exist, but those pieces of testimony do nothing to change the basis for this Court's holding that because these defaults were not timely asserted, they're forever barred.

If anything, this testimony actually supports

Transform's conclusion because it suggests that the landlord could have ascertained and asserted these claims in response to the cure notice.

And very briefly, Your Honor, the final suggestion by Sayville that the Court use this opportunity to reconsider or revisit aspects of the decision in the dismissal order is procedurally unproper six ways to Sunday. First, it is clear that the time for reconsideration or for appeal of that order has long since passed. The landlord took no efforts to timely assert a motion for reconsideration or an appeal, and it certainly can't seek affirmative relief in terms of untimely revisiting the dismissal order through an opposition to a motion to enforce.

Unless Your Honor has any questions, I'll cede the podium to Sayville and reserve reply.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BAUCHNER: Thank you, Your Honor. For the

Page 20 1 record, Joshua Bauchner with Ansell, Grimm, and Aaron for 2 Sayville. Your Honor, the entirety of the defendant's argument requires it to talk out of both sides of its mouth, 3 4 and it does so repeatedly. As an initial matter, on Page 5, Paragraph 6 of 5 6 the reply brief, they say "Sayville argues that the 7 dismissal order is unambiguous and Transform agrees." Well, if that's the case, then why is Transform submitting a 8 9 revised order that materially changes the terms of the 10 original order? If it's --11 THE COURT: That's a good --12 MR. BAUCHNER: -- unambiguous --13 THE COURT: That's a good point. I think the order is unambiguous, and perhaps the only order I should 14 issue is one that clarifies that unless the letter is 15 16 withdrawn, I will hold your firm and your client in contempt 17 of my order. Does that solve that problem? Did I lose you? 18 I think I may have lost him. Mr. Barefoot, are you on the 19 line? 20 MR. BAREFOOT: I am, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Bauchner, are you on the line? 22 MR. BAREFOOT: Yes, Your Honor, he still appears on the Court Solutions dashboard. I'm not sure what the 23 24 issue is. I'm not sure what happened there. 25 THE COURT:

Page 21 1 He's circled in gray now, though, opposed to --2 CLERK: Judge, it's me, Arthur. I think we lost 3 him. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 CLERK: Because I have tried to unmute him, even 6 though I see him on the dashboard, but nothing is happening, 7 and --THE COURT: Well, try to -- make sure he's 8 9 unmuted. 10 CLERK: Yeah, I have, and his box is totally gray 11 from the others. 12 THE COURT: Yeah. Well, I guess we're going to 13 have to wait until he gets back on. 14 CLERK: Yes. I'm going to see if we could get him 15 on the line again. That's --16 THE COURT: Okay, thank you. 17 CLERK: No problem, Judge. 18 THE COURT: (indiscernible). Well, I see Mr. 19 Bauchner's colleague, Mr. D'Artiglio. 20 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, I'm sorry. This is Joshua Bauchner. The Court Solutions is telling us that you 21 22 put us on hold on my line --23 THE COURT: Well --24 MR. BAUCHNER: -- so we just held in --25 THE COURT: All right.

Page 22 1 MR. BAUCHNER: -- Mr. D'Artiglio's line. the last 2 thing we heard you say was that you agree your order is ambiguous and it may be the only order that you needed to 3 issue? 4 5 THE COURT: No, no. I said it's unambiguous. 6 MR. BAUCHNER: Unambiguous. Yes, Your Honor. 7 point is that then court -- the Court Solutions reported you 8 put us on hold. We haven't heard anything that you said 9 since then. I didn't. I apologize for --10 THE COURT: 11 MR. BAUCHNER: No, absolutely. That's okay. 12 That's why we dialed in on Mr. D'Artiglio's line. 13 THE COURT: Fine. 14 MR. BAUCHNER: So, I just -- we haven't heard 15 anything --16 THE COURT: The question was -- okay. So, I said 17 very little after that. Just to repeat, I said that I agree 18 that my January 2020 order is unambiguous and it would seem to me that rather than clarifying it, perhaps the right 19 20 result here should simply be an order that states that 21 unless the landlord withdraws the letter to Justice Jamieson 22 from October 21 and its position taken in that letter, which 23 it never took before me and can't take under my order, I will hold it in contempt and sanction it. 24 25 Does that deal with the adding to the order issue?

MR. BAUCHNER: Well, I don't know that it does, Your Honor, because I don't know that what we're doing doesn't comply with Your Honor's --

THE COURT: Oh, it clearly does not comply with my order, sir, and I'll get to that. But I'm just addressing your concern that somehow by adding addition language to the order I would be changing the order. And I don't want to change the order, because I believe it's crystal clear. So that's my proposed solution for it. You and Mr. Barefoot can think about that solution. But you can continue with the rest of your argument.

MR. BAUCHNER: Well, thank you. I appreciate that, and again, I apologize. We thought we were on hold and dialed in as quickly as we could again.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. BAUCHNER: Thank you. Your Honor, the language of the order is clear, and we agree, and it says defaults under the lease and leases capitalized. We'd also note that that language defaults under the lease came from the original proposed order from the defendant in this action. This is their proposed language, which the Court adopted.

Now what we have here, Your Honor, and what generated this concern initially, is a situation where the Debtor affirmatively denied in affidavits submitted under

Page 24 1 the pain and penalties of perjury in the state court that 2 there were any need for repairs to the property. A representative from the Debtor, who is now testifying on 3 behalf of Transform, thereafter testified that there were 4 5 innumerable problems with the property and that the affidavit that's submitted was false and that those defects 7 and defaults were affirmatively concealed from plaintiffs in 8 this action. 9 So, by the defendant's argue --10 THE COURT: Which action are you referring to? 11 Are you referring to the pre-petition state court action? 12 MR. BAUCHNER: I'm referring to the pre-petition 13 state court action, which an affidavit was submitted by a --14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MR. BAUCHNER: -- a representative --16 THE COURT: Fine. So how is that on fraud on this 17 Court? 18 MR. BAUCHNER: Because in --19 THE COURT: Did you reread the transcript of the 20 hearing from --21 MR. BAUCHNER: Yes, we did, Your Honor --22 THE COURT: -- December of 2019? 23 MR. BAUCHNER: Many times. THE COURT: Did you specifically read the section 24 25 where I told you, contrary to your assertion, that a cure

notice is the Debtors' position in the bankruptcy case as to what defaults are owing, and it is not anything more than that? So, I fail to see any basis for any contention that there has been a fraud on this Court or that the argument you're making now has any weight or merit whatsoever with regard to the issue before me, which is merely an interpretation of my order which enforced another one of my orders which set a bar date for responding to cure notices. So, don't waste any more time on that argument.

MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, that's fine. If the fraud upon the Court is on the state court, we're happy to take it up with the state court. We, however, think that it is compelling and important that the Debtor concealed from this Court, because -- and maybe there is a fraud upon this Court, Your Honor, in that regard.

If the Debtor knew of all of these defaults and filed a cure notice with this Court that reflected zero cure costs, we would respectfully submit, Your Honor, that if they knew of those defaults and submitted that cure cost as zero, that would reflect a fraud upon the bankruptcy court.

THE COURT: It's not a pleading before the Court.

It initiates a response, which your client was perfectly capable of doing, as we discussed at length during the December 2019 hearing in light of, among other things, its filing a proof of claim with respect to such defaults in

Page 26 1 excess of 206 -- \$760,000. 2 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor --3 THE COURT: Don't waste my time on this argument any more. 4 5 MR. BAUCHNER: That's fine, Your Honor. 6 So then maybe I just need to be clear, Your Honor, 7 because -- and I raised this concern initially that there 8 would be some confusion with the state court. Is it the Court's intention that whether we knew of a default or not, 9 10 prior to the assignment and whether those defaults were 11 affirmatively concealed or not, they are barred under Your 12 Honor's order? 13 THE COURT: That is not the issue before me. 14 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, that is exactly what 15 they're proposed order suggests is the issue before you. 16 THE COURT: And I am saying that what I am 17 prepared to deal with is your firm's outrageous letter to 18 Justice Jamieson raising an argument that literally wasn't even raised before me, and after the fact, and completely 19 20 contrary to the extensive colloquy you and I had at the 21 December hearing, raise --22 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor --23 THE COURT: -- argument that is completely 24 unfounded, and I am shocked that you would do this, although 25 perhaps not, given the other arguments you've made in this

pleading and your commencement of the adversary proceeding in this Court originally.

MR. BAUCHNER: Well, I'm sorry --

THE COURT: This is not a Court of ready, shoot, aim. You have to actually act procedurally correctly, and you have not done so, repeatedly. So, I think you're lucky not to be held in contempt today.

MR. BAUCHNER: Well, I certainly --

THE COURT: I don't think you are a bankruptcy lawyer, so I'm cutting you some slack on that, but we spent about 20 minutes going through the rationale, with you asking me questions and me answering them as to the allocation of monetary costs that arose pre-assumption and post-assumption.

There was literally not one speck of an issue as to whether those were costs "after the calling of a default" or upon the exercise of remedies of a default under the lease, but rather the discussion was entirely consistent with the plain language of Section 365 of the Bankruptcy Code and how it has been interpreted, including by the District judge whose name sits on my courthouse, Judge Brieant in the AboveNet, SBC Telecom case.

No Court -- and I'm assuming this includes Justice

Jamieson, who's quite an excellent judge -- appreciates

someone gaming one Court against another, and that's exactly

Pg 28 of 76 Page 28 1 what you're doing here. 2 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, I'm sorry. That is 3 certainly not our intent and I certainly apologize to the 4 Court if it sees it that way. THE COURT: Well, it is now crystal clear, so 5 6 unless you withdraw this contention, I will hold you in 7 contempt with regard to this letter. 8 MR. BAUCHNER: Then, of course, Your Honor, we 9 will withdraw the letter. The issue arose in the state court action, and that's what necessitated the letter. 10 The 11 issue --12 THE COURT: It arose because you raised it. 13 MR. BAUCHNER: No, Your Honor, it arose because 14 the same representative from the Debtor testifying on behalf 15 of Transform claims that previously there were no problems 16 with the property and then testified that they knew about 17 problems with the property the entire time. 18 THE COURT: Do you understand the concept of a bar 19 date? I assume you do, because that was the basis for my 20 January 9 order. 21 MR. BAUCHNER: We certainly do, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Your client was barred because it did

> not assert a cure claim by the deadline set by the Court. So, whether or not it lied before, the Debtor has the benefit of that order, unless you seek some other form of

23

24

Page 29 1 relief, which you have not done. It's that simple. 2 doesn't --3 MR. BAUCHNER: That --THE COURT: -- matter that there was a default. 4 5 You didn't assert it on a timely basis. 6 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that --7 THE COURT: What a bar date is, that's what the 8 whole hearing was about on December 13th, 2019, and that's 9 what my January 9th, 2020 order states. MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that, Your Honor --10 11 THE COURT: But to say that there was a default or 12 that there was a lie about whether there's default or not, 13 doesn't matter. Your client was aware of the claim. It 14 asserted a claim in the bankruptcy case. We went through it 15 at great length at the December hearing. My order is clear. 16 You cannot pursue a claim for pre-assumption costs. 17 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that, Your Honor. 18 We're not seeking to. That's -- and maybe I'm not being 19 clear, and I apologize. THE COURT: Well, I don't --20 21 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor --22 THE COURT: At the same time, you're raising the 23 point that the Debtor contended there were no pre-assumption costs, and now contends there were and it doesn't matter. 24 25 So, don't raise the point. It doesn't matter because you're

time barred.

MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, it's -- the issue is, the issue that generated this, if I may, specifically related to the septic tank, which Your Honor stated at Page 162, Line 13 of the transcript, was a post-assignment issue and is "different default in terms of timing because it is not part of the cure dispute and is a post-assignment dispute." That was a finding of this Court. You said --

THE COURT: Your letter of October 28th, makes no distinction on those grounds. It contends to the contrary that the only defaults barred by my order, the bidding procedures order, and -- frankly, doesn't even reference -- yeah, it does reference the January 9 order as well -- are defaults that were actually given notice by the landlord, and that's just wrong. So --

MR. BAUCHNER: And Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- as far as the septic tank is concerned, that issue was not a factual finding by me and it is not an issue of judicial estoppel because contrary to the statement in your pleading, Transform did not win on that issue. In fact, they lost on that issue because I declined to take jurisdiction over it. Now, it is possible, I suppose, that Transform may be judicially estopped, i.e., by making a judicial admission, although you've not argued that, and it's quite possible they won't be, given the

context of the matter before me, which was not on the facts.

So contrary to what you just said, there was no factual findings by me. It was based on a motion to dismiss a complaint, and we all know that with a complaint, one takes as true the averments in the complaint unless they're contradicted facially by documents incorporated into the complaint or otherwise necessary to the complaint.

So, you may have some argument there on a judicial admission or, you know, on those grounds. I don't know, but that's not before me, either. What is before me is your attempt to argue to Justice Jamieson, withstanding my order, that somehow only a noticed, as per the lease, default is subject to the bar date and the bidding procedures order and my January 9th, 2020 order, and that is completely and utterly outrageous and completely contradicted by the entire context of Section 365 -- which I'll get into in a lengthier ruling in a minute -- the transcript of the hearing, and the order itself.

MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: I don't think I could've been any clearer that the issue --

MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- of allocating cost from what is pre-assumption and from what is post-assumption, and if the costs had arisen pre-assumption, they are barred by the

failure to assert them in response to the cure notice. If they truly arise post assumption, then they're not barred and Transform has to perform.

MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that, Your Honor.

The problem is, in the state court proceeding, Transform is arguing to the contrary and that's what engendered the premotion request letter in the first instance.

In the state court proceeding, Transform is arguing something entirely different than what Your Honor is saying, and that's why they suddenly race back here, and I - respectfully, Your Honor, you don't have the benefit of what's been happening in the state court proceeding, and I appreciate that, but they are arguing that the definition of pre-assumption costs includes any default, known or unknown, to the landlord at any point in time, which we respectfully submit, Your Honor, exceeds the bounds of your order and is not what was intended by your order.

THE COURT: That is not the subject of your letter to Justice Jamieson and it's not before me today.

MR. BAUCHNER: I understand that. I'm simply giving the Court some color as to what's happening in the state court proceeding, and we apologize if our letter to the state court was not clear in that regard, but that --

THE COURT: It wasn't clear at all in that regard.

MR. BAUCHNER: Fair enough, Your Honor.

Page 33 1 THE COURT: It was completely point. 2 MR. BAUCHNER: Fair enough, Your Honor. MR. BAREFOOT: Your Honor, if I could -- if I 3 4 could briefly respond? This is Luke Barefoot from Cleary. THE COURT: Well --5 6 MR. BAUCHNER: (indiscernible). 7 THE COURT: -- Mr. Bauchner finish the rest of his 8 presentation. 9 MR. BAREFOOT: I apologize. 10 MR. BAUCHNER: Thank you, Your Honor. So fine, 11 Your Honor. We submit, the letter wasn't clear. We 12 apologize. We will withdraw it in accord with Your Honor's 13 That's not a problem. The problem is, and this directive. 14 was very directly addressed before Your Honor that we were 15 afraid that this Court's order would cause confusion in the 16 state court, which is now has. 17 And we appreciate Your Honor's perspective that 18 the order is unambiguous, and we agree. But the issues that have been presented to the state court by Transform, we 19 20 believe undermine precisely what this Court argued, which 21 was that these costs were a matter of allocation, which was 22 the Court's term. 23 And what they are now arguing in state court was 24 that every defect with the property, known or unknown to the 25 landlord, which is why we raised the notice provision, is a

pre-assumption default and that everything was barred by this Court's order, which we think ignores the plain terms of this Court's order and ignores the bright line distinction between the defined term pre-assumption costs and post-assumption default.

They are now arguing in state court that
everything wrong with the property was a pre-assumption cost
barred by Your Honor's order. They are now arguing that
everything was previously known -- and I know you don't want
to hear that it was concealed -- but that everything was
previously known as early as 2017 and '18, that everything
is a pre-assumption cost -- this is what their witness
testified to, Your Honor -- and that everything is just thus
barred.

And as Your Honor held, this was a matter of allocation for the state court. As Your Honor further held, the ongoing deterioration of certain items was on -- was a burden for Transform to identify, because anything that arose, deterioration -- any deterioration that arose, excuse me, after the assignment remains the responsibility of Transform and that it was simply an allocation issue for the Court to make those determinations. For the state court, excuse me, to make those determinations.

So again, we apologize if the language in the letter wasn't clear in that regard, but that's what's

Page 35 1 happening before the state court. They are taking Your 2 Honor's order. They're alleging everything wrong with the 3 property was known years ago, is a pre-assumption cost, and everything is thus barred. And was known to the Debtor, 4 Your Honor, notwithstanding that the Debtor at that time 5 6 submitted an affidavit to the Court to the contrary. 7 So, it's not just that the defendant is alleging 8 what the defendant knew. The defendant is alleging what the Debtor knew. And so, Your Honor, I --9 10 THE COURT: It doesn't matter what the Debtor knew 11 as far as the bar date is concerned. It doesn't matter. 12 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that for your 13 purposes, Your Honor. We believe it matters in --14 THE COURT: It -- and it --15 MR. BAUCHNER: -- the state court. 16 THE COURT: And it's my bar date. It's my bar 17 date. MR. BAUCHNER: I understand --18 19 THE COURT: It doesn't matter. 20 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, I understand that it matters in the state court proceeding, as you indicated 21 22 before because if the Debtor submitted an affidavit in the 23 state court proceeding claiming everything was fine with the 24 property and a representative -- the same representative

who's employed by the Debtor now testifying on behalf of

Page 36 1 Transform is testifying that the Debtor knew everything was 2 wrong, we think that has an impact on the state court 3 proceeding. THE COURT: It doesn't. 4 5 MR. BAUCHNER: That's what this is about. 6 THE COURT: As far as the claim being barred, it 7 doesn't. 8 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: All that matters --10 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand it doesn't. 11 THE COURT: -- is what your client knew or could 12 have known in order to file a cure claim. That is all that 13 matters. 14 MR. BAUCHNER: I agree with you, Your Honor. What 15 we knew --16 THE COURT: What the Debtor knew or didn't know is 17 a complete red herring and it's barred. It shouldn't be an 18 issue. Your -- that's res judicata, based on my order. 19 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, I understand that. We 20 understand that, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: So, stop raising it. 22 MR. BAUCHNER: Well, it's barred by your order 23 here, but it's not -- as you pointed out, it's --24 THE COURT: It's res -- do you understand the 25 concept of res judicate? It is barred, period.

	1 9 37 01 70
	Page 37
1	MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, we do understand the
2	concept.
3	THE COURT: Well, then
4	MR. BAUCHNER: That's not
5	THE COURT: stop saying it's not. It's a final
6	order.
7	MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, I'm not
8	THE COURT: Barred
9	MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor
10	THE COURT: from saying that somehow, because
11	the Debtor knew otherwise, the bar doesn't apply. That's
12	just simply wrong. What is
13	MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor
14	THE COURT: potentially relevant and for the
15	state court to decide is whether your client knew or should
16	have known in a way to make a claim. And frankly, it did
17	file a claim and there may or may not be evidence as to
18	specific other amounts which is an issue of fact for the
19	state court to decide, whether it knew or should have known
20	to make the claim.
21	MR. BAUCHNER: We completely agree, Your Honor.
22	That's the point. That's the exact opposite of what
23	Transform is arguing
24	THE COURT: Well, I
25	MR. BAUCHNER: in state court.

THE COURT: You know what, I don't know what they're arguing. You haven't raised it until this, literally, oral argument. It's not the subject of your letter that precipitated this motion before me, and frankly, I don't have much confidence that you're telling me the truth. So, I don't know --

MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- what the extra issue is other than this septic tank issue, which we've already addressed. And the facts are there for the court to decide as to whether -- the state court, as to whether the landlord knew or should have known of the existence of that problem and the need to cure it, which certainly could be done with money, and therefore it would fall within my order if it knew or should've known about it before the cure date and -- or didn't and couldn't have known about it before the cure date. It's a simple issue.

I don't know what other issues you're talking about and I don't need to get into -- what I do need to make clear to you, and I don't expect there to have to be another motion on this, is that the bar order is binding. And so, what the Debtor knew or didn't know, doesn't matter.

MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, what repairs were made or were not made are relevant to the allocation in state court. That's the point. And --

Pg 39 of 76 Page 39 1 THE COURT: No, that's a new point you're raising, 2 and it's enough. Stop raising them. MR. BAUCHNER: Okay, Your Honor. I don't think 3 4 they're new points. I think it's the exact argument we've 5 made throughout the brief, and I don't think anything that I'm saying is new. Everything we're raising with the Court 7 is in the brief, and the concern here, again -- and this was 8 raised during oral argument during our colloquy, Your Honor, 9 was that this was going to cause confusion in state court, 10 and it now has, because they're arguing that everything is a 11 pre-assumption cost and that there is no allegation, 12 regardless of whether the Debtor knew or should have known 13 of it, and that --14 I don't have any example of what THE COURT: 15 they're arguing. I don't have a brief. I don't have any 16 other pleading, so what you're telling me is just, as far as 17 I'm concerned, irrelevant and hot air. 18 MR. BAUCHNER: Well, I'm sorry, Your Honor. 19 had a number of court conferences with the state court where 20 this has come up --21 THE COURT: That's fine. 22 MR. BAUCHNER: Unfortunately, they --23 THE COURT: But you're asking me to weigh in on something that I have no factual basis to address. So --24

MR. BAUCHNER: We're not asking you to weigh in on

Page 40 1 -- we're not asking you to weigh in on anything, Your Honor. 2 We didn't make the application to this Court. We're asking 3 4 THE COURT: You're just -- you just said the real 5 issue here, i.e., before me, is that Transform is 6 misinterpreting my order in some way that you've not really 7 specified specifically except with regard to the septic tank 8 and I've addressed that point. So, there's nothing --9 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor --10 THE COURT: -- more to discuss. 11 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, they're also 12 misrepresenting -- they're also raising issues concerning 13 the fire suppression system that they claim was a pre-14 assumption cost. I'm happy to go through the litany of 15 these things with you, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: No, you don't need to do it. It is 17 really --18 MR. BAUCHNER: I --19 THE COURT: -- simple. Point one, what the Debtor 20 knew or didn't know is irrelevant to the fact that the 21 bidding procedures order and the assumption order and my 22 January 9 order bar your client from asserting claims that 23 it knew or could have known by the cure claim asserting deadline. It's irrelevant. 24 25 Point two, if there is some claim that your client

didn't know or couldn't have known with reasonable inquiry, then I would assume, as Justice Jamieson would conclude, that that is something that couldn't be barred because you couldn't have known about it.

There's really no more beyond that, other than the fact that, really separate and apart from that argument, which to me, frankly, seems to be a way to deflect the argument that actually is before me, this letter was sent which asserts a completely different basis for covering or trying to get your client out from under its failure to assert a timely claims, which is the completely unfounded assertion and really outrageous assertion that your client would've had to have called a default under the lease for that default to be barred by my order.

And that's just flat out wrong.

MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, the two points you just made are all we need, and thank you for that, because with that, we could bring it to the state court and clarify the entire issue, because -- and again, I appreciate Your Honor's frustration with this, but what's happening in state court is, I think, manifest and significant and I think we've -- you've addressed it perfectly for us with what you just said. We can give that to Judge Jamieson and she can proceed accordingly. But it does run contrary to what they've been arguing, and that's the concern. We didn't

Pg 42 of 76 Page 42 come before the Court for this relieve, Your Honor. We were simply --THE COURT: I can see why they did, given this letter. MR. BAUCHNER: Well, Your Honor, we were arguing in state court that pre-assumption costs were, as you said, those which were known or should have been known to us, and they've made the contrary argument that everything is a preassumption cost, regardless of whether it was known or could've been known, and that's --THE COURT: And I want to be clear, because I do not want this misinterpreted, either, although there's no reason it should be, because the transcript is crystal clear on this. I gave you about four examples from the December transcript. My order does not apply to just literally liquidated costs. It applies to bar pre-assumption costs that could be described and ultimately liquidated, so that, for example, if you would've asserted or you should've asserted or the client should've asserted a cure cost of X plus any additional amounts ultimately determined to have to be applied to fix whatever the condition was, that was covered by your proof of claim, for example.

So, it's not just the liquidated amount and I was

crystal clear that what was barred includes that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 43 1 (indiscernible) amount as fixed by the Court that is 2 attributable to or allocatable to the pre-petition -- the 3 pre-assumption period. 4 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: So, I don't expect there to be any 6 argument to the contrary of that, either. I don't know 7 whether you would, but just to be safe, I'm reaffirming that point, which I made at length in the transcript of the 8 9 December hearing. 10 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that, Your Honor. 11 Again, the issue is the known -- just like you said, Your 12 Honor. Knew or should have known on the part of the 13 landlord. 14 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. 15 MR. BAUCHNER: And they're asserting something 16 otherwise in state court, which again --17 THE COURT: All right. 18 MR. BAUCHNER: -- was the concern, and --19 THE COURT: All right. 20 MR. BAUCHNER: -- we want to address --21 THE COURT: I will be clear. If there's a 22 position taken contrary to that by your client in state court, I will hold it in contempt. I think there's 23 24 literally no excuse at this point. 25 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, and I would just hope

Page 44 1 that if the same were true, that if Transform takes a 2 position contrary to that, they would be an issue as well, because that's the concern here. 3 4 THE COURT: Okay. MR. BAUCHNER: So, Your Honor, with that, I don't 5 6 know that you want to hear more from me on this, frankly. 7 So, we understand Your Honor's ruling and we're -- it is exactly what we've been arguing in state court and we're 8 9 prepared to continue to argue that in state court, that it's 10 an issue of allocation. It's an issue of what the landlord 11 should've known or could've known, and nothing more. And 12 the -- we'll also raise the other issues and concerns with 13 respect to the affidavit that was submitted and the estoppel 14 issues in state court, because we completely agree, Your 15 Honor directed the state court to be the fact finder --16 THE COURT: No. 17 MR. BAUCHNER: -- with respect to --18 THE COURT: The affidavit has not relevance, 19 unless it actually misled your client. MR. BAUCHNER: Well, it --20 21 THE COURT: What the Debtor knew has no relevance, 22 and you count it as a fraud on the Court, and that's not 23 applicable because your client is barred regardless of what the Debtor knew. 24 25 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, it did mislead us

Page 45 1 because their affidavit specifically said that --2 THE COURT: That's a separate --3 MR. BAUCHNER: -- conditions were --THE COURT: -- issue, but you cannot say that 4 5 somehow the Debtor committed a fraud on the Court that is relevant to the bar date, other than the issue of what your 7 client knew. 8 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Or should have known. 10 MR. BAUCHNER: Again --11 THE COURT: Well, again, that was not clear at all 12 in your pleadings, which simply referred to the fact that 13 the Debtor acted improperly, which --14 MR. BAUCHNER: Well, Your Honor, we believe that 15 an affidavit submitted to the state court under the pains 16 and penalties of perjury that contains misinformation is for 17 the state court to make a determination as to the 18 significance of that affidavit. That's all I'm saying, with respect to the affidavit, and if state court --19 20 THE COURT: It's not relevant to the bar. 21 MR. BAUCHNER: We understand, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: The bar date. MR. BAUCHNER: We understand that. It's relevant 23 24 to the allocation issue. If they're claiming --25 THE COURT: It's relevant to what your client knew

Page 46 1 or should have known. 2 MR. BAUCHNER: Exactly right. Exactly right, Your 3 Honor, and if they're telling us --THE COURT: It's not an issue of fraud on the 4 5 Court or sanctions that I should be awarding or anything 6 like that. 7 MR. BAUCHNER: Completely agree, Your Honor --8 THE COURT: which is what you argued in your 9 objection, that somehow the Debtors' conduct should relieve 10 your client of the bar date --11 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor --THE COURT: -- the order, and that's just not --12 13 it's not appropriate. 14 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, we're arguing that the 15 Debtors' conduct in the state court goes to the allocation 16 issue in state --17 THE COURT: Well, it doesn't. It doesn't go to 18 the allocation issue at all. It may go to the issue of what your client knew or should have known, period, but nothing 19 20 else. 21 MR. BAUCHNER: Agreed, Your Honor, and then what 22 we knew or should have known goes to the allocation issue. 23 THE COURT: Only in that sense, and no other. 24 MR. BAUCHNER: Agreed. Agreed. 25 THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BAUCHNER: That's the point, and we agree with you that it's not before Your Honor as to the significance of a potentially perjurious affidavit submitted in the state court proceeding. That's for the state --

THE COURT: Well --

MR. BAUCHNER: -- to address.

THE COURT: I'm not sure I understand that. I guess you agree on that now, although you took up about five pages of your pleading as well as submitting lengthy exhibits and transcripts to the contrary, but I will ignore those because you're asking me to.

MR. BAUCHNER: Very good, Your Honor. Like I said before, I think we have said all we can say on this issue and we understand the Court's ruling.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Barefoot, do you have anything to add?

MR. BAREFOOT: Your Honor, I just want to clarify one point, which is that -- and I believe this is consistent with Your Honor's ruling. Transform is entitled through discovery or otherwise, to develop a record on what conditions existed and were known or could have been known to the landlord. And regardless of what was alleged in the adversary complaint before this Court, if the facts ultimately show that the septic tank, the fire suppression system, or any other issues existed and could have been

Page 48 1 asserted by the landlord in response to the cure notice, 2 those are barred, regardless of what was alleged in the 3 adversary complaint as to when they arose. THE COURT: No doubt. 4 5 MR. BAUCHNER: Your Honor, just to be clear, could 6 have been asserted, depends on what we knew or should have 7 known. THE COURT: Well, of course, but that's what Mr. 8 9 Barefoot said, that they're entitled to take discovery on. 10 MR. BAUCHNER: Understood. Understood, Your 11 Honor, but we need to be very precise here, because it's not 12 just that it could have been asserted. It's that we knew or 13 should have known about them, and they have taken discovery 14 on this issue --15 THE COURT: That's fine. 16 MR. BAUCHNER: -- and --17 THE COURT: I mean, obviously, if the discovery 18 says we knew nothing about it and it was kept from us, you 19 know, we don't have access. We don't inspect. 20 clear. 21 MR. BAUCHNER: Again, we agree, Your Honor. Ιt 22 was kept from us. We were --23 THE COURT: Well, I don't know. That's for Justice Jamieson to decide. 24 25 MR. BAUCHNER: Exactly right, which is exactly

Pg 49 of 76 Page 49 1 what we're hoping for her to decide, Your Honor, and that's 2 exactly what's happening in the state court now. 3 THE COURT: All right. Anything else? MR. BAREFOOT: Your Honor, just one point in terms 4 5 of this known or could have known standard. Obviously, 6 there's a litany of cases in the mass tort context and 7 otherwise, where even if the claimant had no reason or basis to know of the basis for a claim, if it was not asserted, it 8 9 still cannot be asserted. So, I believe that it's a bit of 10 a red herring to focus on what the landlord knew. 11 THE COURT: It's a red herring to focus just on 12 what the landlord knew, but if the landlord really had no 13 reason to know, I think that it's going to be hard to justify that a bar date would be binding on someone in that 14 15 context. 16 MR. BAUCHNER: And Your Honor, what Mr. Barefoot 17 said is the precise argument they're making in state court, 18 which you just acknowledged it would've been hard for us to 19 (indiscernible). That's, again, the concern in the state 20 court proceeding, that it's -- regardless of what we knew or 21 could have known, it's (indiscernible).

22 THE COURT: Okay.

> MR. BAREFOOT: Your Honor, how would you prefer that we proceed in terms of settling an order? I do --

THE COURT: Well, let me --

23

24

MR. BAREFOOT: -- have a concern --

THE COURT: Let me give you my ruling, first.

MR. BAREFOOT: Okay, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I have before me a motion by Transform Operating Stores, LLC for an order clarifying and enforcing my order dated January 9, 2020 in this adversary proceeding which, granted in part and denied in part, as set forth in that order, Transform's motion under Bankruptcy Rule 7012, incorporating Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), to dismiss the claims in the complaint, which sought payment by Transform of amounts claimed to be owing under the lease between Sayville Menlo, LLC, the plaintiff, and Transform as assignee of the lease from the Debtor, Sears.

The primary basis for the relief sought by

Transform in that original motion was that the landlord,

Sayville, had failed to assert any cure costs by the

deadline set by the Court in its bidding procedures order of

November 19, 2018 appearing at Docket 816 as then

implemented through the Court's order authorizing the

assumption and the potential assignment of the lease to

Transform, appearing at ECF 3850.

The bidding procedures order provided that if a cure amount was not asserted timely in response to the cure notice, which was indisputably sent to Sayville, the cure amount set forth on the notice would be binding and no

further obligation under Section 365(b)(1) of a monetary nature would be owed by the Debtor and its assignee,

Transform.

The Debtor put in its cure notice zero dollars owing and concededly, there was no timely response to that cure notice, and therefore, I concluded after a lengthy hearing on the motion that took place in December of 2019 that all pre-assumption amounts owing would be barred, and therefore, claims in respect of those amounts should be dismissed.

I made it crystal clear in the order as I did during the oral argument that pre-assumption costs include any amounts required to cure defaults under the lease arising prior to the assumption and assignment date, whether they would be paid by a tenant directly to the landlord or by the tenant to third parties to perform repairs and the like.

The Bankruptcy Code provides, in Section

365(b)(1), that "If there has been a default in an unexpired lease of the Debtor, the Trustee or Debtor in Possession may not assume such lease unless, at the time of assumption of such lease, the Trustee or Debtor in Possession cures or provides adequate assurance that the Trustee will promptly cure such default other than a default that is a breach of a provision relating to the satisfaction of any provision

other than a penalty rate or penalty provision relating to a default arising from any failure to perform non-monetary obligations under an unexpired lease of real property, if it is impossible for the Trustee to cure such default by performing non-monetary acts and, at and after the time of assumption, except that if such default arises from a failure to operate in accordance with a nonresidential real property lease, then such default shall be cured by performance at and after the time of assumption in accordance with such lease, and pecuniary losses resulting from such default shall be compensated in accordance with the provisions of this paragraph," i.e., cured or there be a provision of a prompt cure.

It was clear to me from the complaint and the record of oral argument that the repair and other defaults under the lease for purposes of the cure provision of the Bankruptcy Code could all be dealt with by the payment of money. Indeed, the plaintiff landlord had filed a proof of claim in respect of most of those asserted defaults, asserting monetary amount of at least roughly \$760,000, with the reservation that might more be owed -- more might be owed ultimately, once the claim was liquidated.

My order makes it, I believe, crystal clear that any such amounts owing, regardless of any specific provision of the lease notwithstanding, will be the responsibility of

the plaintiff as far as there being pre-assumption costs, because again, the bar date had been set and there was no response to the cure notice filed by the Debtors that asserted no cure amounts would be owing.

To fix the allocation as to any ongoing postassumption performance obligations that did not arise preassumption and were not barred by the Court's prior orders,
the parties returned to state court. The current motion
arose because of a letter dated October 28, 2020 to the
state court justice presiding over that litigation, the
Honorable Linda Jamieson, sent by counsel for the landlord.

It asserted, quite shockingly to me, given the clarity of my January 9, 2020 order, the colloquy which was extensive, and oral argument with the landlord's counsel, and the fact that this point had never been raised before me, that only defaults noticed by the landlord under Paragraph 12.01 of the lease were covered by my order; i.e., to be barred, by my prior orders, the default would've had to have been noticed formally by the landlord as set forth in the lease.

As I stated, this argument was never raised before me. If it had been, it would've been immediately shot down. The law is crystal clear that when Congress in the Bankruptcy Code refers, in Section 365(b)(1) of the Code, to a default in an unexpired lease, it is referring to a breach

of the lease, not to the mechanics of setting out the default. It is a more generic term of default under the lease.

To rule otherwise or to interpret the code
otherwise would be to permit, as Judge Brieant held in the
AboveNet case that I previously cited, to raise default
later, in essence, hiding in the weeds, which would limit a
Debtor's flexibility to determine whether to assume or
reject a lease.

Indeed, Judge Brieant described that argument in the AboveNet case as "essentially frivolous." AboveNet v. SBC Telecom (2007 U.S. District Lexis 13651 at Pages 4-5 S.D.N.Y. February 27, 2007). See also in re: Metromedia Fiber Network, Inc., 335 B.R. 41, 49-51 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2005).

The whole point of a cure notice procedure is to flag potential cure issues so that they can inform a Debtor's, its creditor constituents', and ultimately the Court's judgment as to whether a lease should be assumed or not, given the likelihood of potential defaults and the amount of them, to be followed up by a procedure to actually, if the default is timely asserted, liquidate the specific amount and provide for its cure or prompt cure, a regime that the Bankruptcy Code requires that is independent of and supersedes the regimen for calling a default under a

lease under applicable non-bankruptcy law.

The letter never should've been sent and, as I noted, I will grant the motion as follows. I will hold that the sending of the letter was a violation of a January 9, 2020 order, and if it is not promptly retracted, and if the landlord fails to act in conformity with my ruling, I will in the future hold it in contempt on due notice to the landlord.

The objection to the motion asserts other points that are either legally or procedurally incorrect or both.

I guess the first point I should address is the contention 11 months after the entry of the now obviously final January 9, 2020 order, that it was somehow incorrect as a matter of law and should be vacated. Of course, the time to make such a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59, incorporated by Bankruptcy Rule 9023, has passed and there was no attempt to make such a motion under Bankruptcy Rule 9024 incorporating Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60.

Moreover, the contention is simply incorrect. As I noted from the plain language of the statute that I previously quoted, if a performance obligation can be quantified monetarily, it needs to be cured with money. The complaint and the proof of claim and the oral argument made it clear that each of these obligations could be cured by the payment of money. The caselaw cited for this section of

the objection was, therefore, completely off point and, in some cases, totally mis-cited. Whether it's monetary or non-monetary, the point is, must it be cured with money? If it must, then the bar date mechanism for responding to cure notice needed to be responded to and here, that was the case and it was not responded to.

In addition, the objection spent considerable ink on the notion that the Debtor committed a fraud on the court, not specifying which court. It is clear to me that the Debtor did not commit any fraud on this Court in any way and it should've been clear to counsel for the landlord, given the colloquy and oral argument in December of 2019, in which I made it clear that a cure notice is the Debtors' position on whether there is a cure or not, just as a landlord's response to a cure notice is merely the landlord's position on whether the cure amount is owing.

And ultimately, as set forth in the bidding procedures order and the assumption order, the Court sorts out the proper amount of cure, if there was a timely response to the cure notice.

As far as whether there was a fraud on the state court, again, that appears to me to be irrelevant and a red herring as far as to whether the Debtor is somehow estopped from relying upon the cure notice. It set a date to assert a cure claim. The landlord's failure to assert a cure

claim, unless it is excused for some reason applicable to notices setting such dates, i.e., it did not know nor could it have known of the existence of the claim, it has been argued, the landlord would be barred, period.

Finally, it is argued that because at oral argument in the December 2019 argument, counsel for Transform assumed that the so-called septic tank default was a post-assumption default. Apparently as asserted in the complaint, Transform should now be judicially estopped from asserting that it was a pre-petition default. I'm sorry, pre-assumption default. Clearly, and contrary to the assertion in the objection, Transform should not be judicially estopped from taking that position as required by the case law going back to New Hampshire v. Maine, 532 U.S. 742, 749 (2011).

Judicial estoppel requires, among other things, that the party to whom it would apply be taking a position in front of a Court contrary to a position that it took in front of another Court, upon which it prevailed. Before me, Transform did not prevail on this position. Indeed, it lost on this position because I concluded that I did not have jurisdiction over the determination of the post-assumption cure amount, and therefore, would not decide it. I deferred instead, to the state court or to the parties to work out the amount.

Obviously, given that the motion before me was one to dismiss a complaint, that was not a factual finding by this Court, but based upon the assertions in the complaint and Transform's apparent understanding at that time, so judicial estoppel, which was argued here, may not apply -- or does not apply. Excuse me. Whether any other doctrine of estoppel applies, I doubt, but it's not an issue before me.

So as far as the order is concerned, I don't need any further reinterpretation of the order granting this motion. What precipitated the motion was the October 28th, 2020 letter and the order should state that that letter was in violation of my January 9th, 2020 order and that I will hold the landlord in contempt unless it is promptly withdrawn, and the landlord does not take the position asserted in that letter in the state court litigation.

So, Mr. Barefoot, I'd like you to prepare the order, but I think it should be that simple. It can refer to my bench ruling. You can provide Justice Jamieson with the transcript, if you wish, but I don't think we need any further interpretation of my order.

MR. BAREFOOT: We will do so, Your Honor. Might I also suggest that Your Honor so order the record of the proceedings today?

THE COURT: Well, there's really no -- there's no

Page 59 such thing. But again, I have a bench ruling. I'll ask you to send me the transcript so that I can make sure it doesn't have typos or the like, and again, you can provide a copy of that to Justice Jamieson. MR. BAREFOOT: We will do so, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. Very well. All right. Anything else? MS. MARCUS: Your Honor --MR. BAREFOOT: Not from Transform, Your Honor. MS. MARCUS: That brings us to the end of today's agenda. THE COURT: Okay, very well. Ms. Marcus, I do want to ask you, at the monthly omnibus hearings, from time to time, Mr. Wander has said he wanted to hear the World Imports issue or have me hear it, and I thought I had scheduled it for this month. Has that now been resolved or do we need to check with someone else at Weil Gotshal? MS. MARCUS: I think my partner, Gary Fail may be on, but I think he's in listen-only mode. I'm pretty certain it has not been resolved; although, perhaps relevant objection has been withdrawn. That's my --THE COURT: Okay. All right. I thought that I had scheduled it for a hearing for this month, but maybe the parties have moved it by agreement. Anyway, one of my clerks will check with Mr. Fail to follow up on the status

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

	Page 60
1	of whether there are any remaining issues on that claim
2	objection dispute that are going to be teed up in the near
3	future.
4	MS. MARCUS: Okay, Your Honor. That would be
5	better. Thank you.
6	THE COURT: Okay. Very well. Thank you. So, I'm
7	going to hang up at this point. Thank you all.
8	MR. BAREFOOT: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	
10	(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at
11	11:28 AM)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 61 1 CERTIFICATION 2 3 I, Sonya Ledanski Hyde, certified that the foregoing 4 transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. 5 Sonya M. Scolarski Hyde 6 7 8 Sonya Ledanski Hyde 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 Veritext Legal Solutions 21 330 Old Country Road 22 Suite 300 Mineola, NY 11501 23 24 25 Date: December 11, 2020

[& - afraid] Page 1

			T
&	20 27:11	49-51 54:14	accurate 61:4
& 3:4 5:3,10,18	2005 54:15	5	acknowledged
7:22	2007 54:12,13	5 20:5	49:18
0	2011 57:15	532 57:14	act 27:5 55:6
07424 5:6	2017 34:11	59 55:15	acted 45:13
	2018 50:18 2019 8:10 15:8	6	action 23:21 24:8
1	24:22 25:24 29:8	6 20:5 50:9	24:10,11,13 28:10 acts 52:5
1 51:1,19 53:24	51:7 56:12 57:6	60 55:18	add 12:19 47:16
10 1:23 3:2	2020 1:23 3:2 13:8	7	adding 22:25 23:6
10,000 8:19 10:5	13:12,22 22:18	_	addition 12:1
10/15/2018 3:7	29:9 31:14 50:6	7012 50:8	18:14 23:6 56:7
10/31/201 3:7	53:9,13 55:5,13	742 57:15	additional 8:18
10006 5:13	58:12,13 61:25	749 57:15	9:3 10:5 42:21
10112 6:4 10153 5:21	206 26:1	760,000 26:1	address 8:3 39:24
	21 22:22	52:20	43:20 47:6 55:11
10601 1:21 10:00 3:2	23 4:1	767 5:20	addressed 33:14
10:00 3.2 10:04 1:24	248 1:20	8	38:9 40:8 41:22
10:04 1.24 11 55:12 61:25	25 3:14,18	816 50:18	addressing 23:5
11 33.12 01.23 11/12/2020 4:5	27 54:13	9	adequate 51:23
11/12/2020 4.3 11501 61:23	28 13:12 53:9	9 3:7 13:8 28:20	admission 30:24
11:28 60:11	28th 30:9 58:11	30:13 40:22 50:6	31:9
12 50:9	29 4:6	53:13 55:4,13	adopted 18:7
12.01 53:17	3	9/2020 3:24	23:22
125,000 8:14 10:2	3 12:12	9016 3:8	adv 1:4
13 12:12 30:5	30 3:20 6:3	9023 55:16	advanced 14:13
13651 54:12	300 1:20 61:22	9024 55:18	adversary 3:10,16
13th 15:7 29:8	31st 8:10	9th 29:9 31:14	3:22 4:1,2 11:2
14 4:1 15:15	330 61:21	58:13	13:19 27:1 47:23
151 18:12	335 54:14	a	48:3 50:6
16 18:12	365 5:5 14:7,22	a.m. 3:2	advisor 3:6 6:2
161 15:8,15	17:2,7 27:19	aaron 5:3 11:15	8:8
162 30:5	31:16 51:1,19	20:1	affect 11:6
18 15:15 34:11	53:24	abovenet 27:22	affidavit 24:6,13
18-235328 1:3	3850 50:21	54:6,11,11	35:6,22 44:13,18
19 50:18	4	absolutely 9:11	45:1,15,18,19
19-08286 1:4 3:10		22:11	47:3
3:16,22 4:2 13:21	4 16:17 4-5 54:12	accept 18:3	affidavits 23:25
2	4-5 54:12 41 54:14	access 48:19	affirmative 19:19
2 15:8	41 34:14 41st 6:3	accord 33:12	affirmatively
2,476,936 8:11	47,154.66 3:8	accounting 6:2	23:25 24:7 26:11
2,476,936.00 3:7	47,154.66. 8:12	8:8	afraid 33:15
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	77,137,00, 0.12		

agenda 3:1 7:18	answering 27:12	39:10,15 41:25	57:12
7:24,25 8:1 59:11	anthony 3:19	42:5 44:8 46:14	assertions 58:3
ago 11:20 35:3	anyway 59:24	argument 13:3	asserts 17:10 41:9
agree 22:2,17	apart 41:6	20:3 23:11 25:4,9	55:9
23:17 33:18 36:14	apologize 12:14	26:3,18,23 31:8	assignee 50:13
37:21 44:14 46:7	22:10 23:13 28:3	38:3 39:4,8 41:6,8	51:2
47:1,8 48:21	29:19 32:22 33:9	42:8 43:6 49:17	assignment 13:24
agreed 8:18 10:2	33:12 34:24	51:12 52:15 53:14	14:18 15:6,14,17
10:5 46:21,24,24	apparent 58:4	53:21 54:10 55:23	16:15 18:15 26:10
agreement 9:11	apparently 57:8	56:12 57:6,6	30:5,7 34:20
59:24	appeal 19:16,18	arguments 26:25	50:20 51:14
agrees 20:7	appearing 6:8	arisen 31:25	assume 13:5
aim 27:5	50:18,21	arises 52:6	28:19 41:2 51:21
air 39:17	appears 12:3	arising 51:14 52:2	54:8
al 1:15 3:11,17,23	20:22 56:22	arose 13:24 17:24	assumed 54:19
4:3	applicable 44:23	18:1 27:13 28:9	57:7
allegation 39:11	55:1 57:1	28:12,13 34:19,19	assuming 9:2
allegations 18:3,5	application 3:4	48:3 53:9	27:23
18:8,10,17	8:2,10,14,15,17	arrange 7:11	assumption 13:24
alleged 47:22 48:2	8:19,21 9:7,13,20	arthur 21:2	14:18 16:20 27:13
alleging 35:2,7,8	9:24,24 40:2	articulated 15:5	27:14 29:16,23
allocatable 43:2	applications 9:13	ascertained 19:9	31:24,24,25 32:2
allocating 31:23	9:21	asking 27:12	32:14 34:1,4,5,7
allocation 27:13	applied 42:22	39:23,25 40:1,2	34:12 35:3 39:11
33:21 34:16,21	applies 42:17 58:7	47:11	40:14,21 42:6,9
38:24 44:10 45:24	apply 37:11 42:15	aspects 19:13	42:17 43:3 50:20
46:15,18,22 53:5	57:17 58:5,6	assert 14:24 15:9	51:8,12,14,21
allow 14:23	appreciate 9:17	19:17 28:23 29:5	52:6,9 53:1,6,7
ambiguous 22:3	23:12 32:13 33:17	32:1 41:11 50:16	56:18 57:8,11,22
amended 3:14,25	41:19	56:24,25	assurance 51:23
7:25	appreciates 27:24	asserted 15:18,22	attack 14:8
amount 9:25	appropriate	15:23,24 18:16	attacks 17:21
15:13,18,19 42:24	46:13	19:6,9 29:14	attempt 31:11
43:1 50:23,25	approve 3:12	42:19,19,20 48:1	55:17
52:20 54:21,23	argue 24:9 31:11	48:6,12 49:8,9	attorney 5:4
56:16,19 57:23,25	44:9	50:23 52:19 53:4	attorneys 5:11,19
amounts 15:17,22	argued 30:24	53:12 54:22 57:8	11:5
15:22,24 19:2	33:20 46:8 57:4,5	58:16	attributable 43:2
37:18 42:21 50:11	58:5	asserting 16:19	audit 9:22
51:8,9,13 52:24	argues 17:23 20:6	40:22,23 43:15	auditor 3:6 6:2
53:4	arguing 17:24	52:20 57:10	8:8
ansell 5:3 11:15	32:6,9,13 33:23	assertion 16:7	authority 17:6
20:1	34:6,8 37:23 38:2	24:25 41:12,12	
		1014	

[authorized - claim]

authorized 7:8	48:2 51:8 53:7,18	believe 14:6,15	cap 18:13
authorizing 50:19	57:4	15:8 16:2 23:8	cap 18.13
avenue 5:20	base 15:2 19:2	33:20 35:13 45:14	capitalized 23:18
averments 31:5	based 7:25 13:24	47:18 49:9 52:23	_
			captioned 13:20
avoid 17:19	17:4,16 31:3	bench 15:5 58:19 59:1	case 1:3,4 8:8,9,13
awarding 46:5 awards 10:8	36:18 58:3	benefit 28:25	9:21,23 13:21 16:11 17:3 20:8
	basis 7:13,15 15:20 19:5 25:3	32:11	
aware 29:13	28:19 29:5 39:24		25:1 27:22 29:14
b		better 60:5	54:6,11 56:5 57:14
b 2:1 10:7 50:9	41:9 49:7,8 50:14 bauchner 5:8	beyond 41:5	caselaw 55:25
51:1,19 53:24		bidding 14:2,7,20	
b.r. 54:14	11:14,15 12:7,8	14:25 16:15,25	cases 49:6 56:2
back 21:13 32:10	12:11,19,22 19:25	17:5,16 30:11	cause 33:15 39:9
57:14	20:1,12,21 21:20	31:13 40:21 50:17	cede 19:22
bankr 54:14	21:21,24 22:1,6	50:22 56:17	certain 17:24
bankruptcy 1:1	22:11,14 23:1,12	binding 38:21	34:17 59:20
1:19 2:3 25:1,20	23:16 24:12,15,18	49:14 50:25	certainly 19:18
27:9,19 29:14	24:21,23 25:10	bit 49:9	27:8 28:3,3,21
50:8 51:18 52:17	26:2,5,14,22 27:3	bounds 32:16	38:13
53:24 54:24 55:1	27:8 28:2,8,13,21	box 21:10	certified 61:3
55:16,17	29:3,6,10,17,21	breach 15:11	chambers 8:25
bar 25:8 28:18	30:2,16 31:19,22	51:24 53:25	10:6,13
29:7 31:13 35:11	32:4,20,25 33:2,6	brieant 27:22	change 12:16 17:3
35:16,16 37:11	33:7,10 35:12,15	54:5,10	19:5 23:8
38:21 40:22 42:17	35:18,20 36:5,8	brief 3:18 13:2,16	changed 11:24
45:6,20,22 46:10	36:10,14,19,22	20:6 39:5,7,15	12:5
49:14 53:2 56:4	37:1,4,7,9,13,21	briefly 9:8 15:2	changes 20:9
barefoot 5:15	37:25 38:7,23	17:8 19:11 33:4	changing 23:7
11:4,10,11,18,18	39:3,18,22,25	bright 34:3	check 59:17,25
12:3,25,25 13:15	40:9,11,18 41:16	bring 41:18	circled 21:1
13:18,18 20:18,20	42:5 43:4,10,15	brings 59:10	circulated 8:22
20:22 23:9 33:3,4	43:18,20,25 44:5	bulk 9:21	cited 16:3 54:6
33:9 47:15,17	44:17,20,25 45:3	burden 17:19	55:25 56:2
48:9 49:4,16,23	45:8,10,14,21,23	34:18	civil 50:9 55:15,18
50:1,3 58:17,22	46:2,7,11,14,21	buyers 14:25	claim 15:9,17
59:5,9 60:8	46:24 47:1,6,12	c	25:25 28:23 29:13
barred 14:17 15:9	48:5,10,16,21,25	c 5:1 7:1 61:1,1	29:14,16 36:6,12
19:6 26:11 28:22	49:16	call 11:6 18:18	37:16,17,20 40:13
30:1,11 31:25	bauchner's 21:19	called 41:13 57:7	40:23,25 42:23
32:2 34:1,8,14	behalf 3:19 7:22	calling 27:16	49:8 52:19,22
35:4 36:6,17,22	11:12,15 24:4	54:25	55:23 56:25 57:1
36:25 37:8 41:3	28:14 35:25	camp 5:5	57:3 60:1
41:14 42:25 44:23			

Page 3

[claimant - course] Page 4

claimant 49:7	53:24 54:4,24	concerning 4:5	contradicted 31:6
claimed 15:14	collateral 17:21	40:12	31:15
50:11	collaterally 14:8	concerns 9:16	contrary 16:22
claiming 35:23	colleague 21:19	44:12	24:25 26:20 30:10
45:24	colleagues 9:15	conclude 41:2	30:19 31:2 32:6
claims 13:23	colloquy 18:9	concluded 51:6	35:6 41:24 42:8
14:16,24 19:3,9	26:20 39:8 53:13	57:21 60:10	43:6,22 44:2
28:15 40:22 41:11	56:12	conclusion 19:8	47:10 57:11,18
50:10 51:9	color 32:21	condition 42:22	contravention
clarifies 20:15	come 39:20 42:1	conditions 45:3	14:25
clarify 41:18	commencement	47:21	cooperation 9:18
47:17	27:1	conduct 46:9,15	copy 7:12 10:11
clarifying 22:19	comment 11:24	conferences 39:19	59:3
50:5	commit 56:10	confidence 38:5	core 15:3
clarity 53:13	committed 45:5	confirm 14:5	corporation 1:8
clear 12:14,20	56:8	conformity 55:6	correct 9:5,11
19:15 23:8,17	compelling 25:13	confusion 26:8	corrected 11:21
26:6 28:5 29:15	compensated	33:15 39:9	12:4
29:19 32:23,24	52:11	congress 53:23	correction 12:9
33:11 34:25 38:20	compensation 3:5	considerable 56:7	correctly 27:5
42:11,13,25 43:21	complaint 3:14	consistent 16:3	cost 25:19 31:23
45:11 48:5,20	18:4 31:4,4,5,7,7	27:18 47:18	34:7,12 35:3
51:11 52:14,23	47:23 48:3 50:10	constituents	39:11 40:14 42:9
53:23 55:24 56:9	52:14 55:23 57:9	54:18	42:20
56:11,13	58:2,3	contact 7:10	costs 16:21 18:14
clearer 31:21	complete 36:17	contains 45:16	25:18 27:13,16
clearly 23:4 57:11	completely 7:4	contempt 20:16	29:16,24 31:25
cleary 5:10 11:4	26:19,23 31:14,15	22:24 27:7 28:7	32:14 33:21 34:4
11:11,18 13:1,19	33:1 37:21 41:9	43:23 55:7 58:14	42:6,16,17 50:16
33:4	41:11 44:14 46:7	contended 29:23	51:12 53:1
clerk 21:2,5,10,14	56:1	contends 29:24	could've 10:1
21:17	comply 23:3,4	30:10	31:20 42:10 44:11
clerk's 7:11,12	concealed 24:7	contention 15:3	counsel 7:20 8:6
clerks 59:25	25:13 26:11 34:10	25:3 28:6 55:11	8:23 10:6,12
client 7:5 20:16	concededly 51:5	55:19	53:11,14 56:11
25:22 28:22 29:13	concept 28:18	contentions 17:9	57:6
36:11 37:15 40:22	36:25 37:2	contesting 18:4	count 44:22
40:25 41:10,12	concern 23:6,24	context 31:1,16	counterparties
42:20 43:22 44:19	26:7 39:7 41:25	49:6,15	16:5
44:23 45:7,25	43:18 44:3 49:19	continue 23:10	country 61:21
46:10,19	50:1	44:9	course 7:16 9:20
code 17:2 27:20	concerned 30:18	contract 15:11,17	18:2 28:8 48:8
51:18 52:17 53:24	35:11 39:17 58:9	16:4	55:14

[court - defendant's]

Page 5

court 1:1,19 7:2,6	45:4,5,9,11,15,17	cured 52:8,12	debtor's 54:8,18		
7:9,11 8:3,4 9:2,6	45:19,20,22,25	55:22,24 56:3	debtors 5:19 7:20		
9:19 10:10,16,19	46:4,5,8,12,15,17	cures 51:22	7:22 8:23 10:12		
10:24 11:8,13,17	46:23,25 47:4,5,7	current 53:8	11:7 18:24 19:1		
12:1,7,9,18,21,24	47:15,23 48:4,8	cutting 27:10	25:1 46:9,15 53:3		
13:4,17 14:5,5,12	48:15,17,23 49:2		56:13		
13.4,17 14.3,3,12	49:3,11,17,20,22	d	december 1:23		
17:21 18:7,12,18	49:25 50:2,4,17	d 2:2 7:1	3:2 13:9 15:7		
, ,		d'artiglio 3:19	24:22 25:24 26:21		
18:20 19:12,24	53:8,10 56:9,9,10	21:19			
20:11,13,21,23,25	56:18,22 57:18,19 57:24 58:3,16,25	d'artiglio's 13:10	29:8,15 42:14 43:9 51:7 56:12		
21:4,8,12,16,18	· · ·	22:1,12	57:6 61:25		
21:21,23,25 22:5	59:6,12,22 60:6 court's 9:10,14	daily 7:13			
22:7,7,10,13,16	,	daluz 6:10 10:17	decide 37:15,19 38:10 48:24 49:1		
23:4,15,21 24:1	14:1,12 15:4,21	10:20	57:23		
24:10,11,13,14,16	15:24 17:12,12,16 17:19 18:9 19:5	damages 15:10			
24:17,19,22,24		dashboard 20:23	decision 19:13		
25:4,11,11,12,14	26:9 33:15,22 34:2,3 47:14	21:6	decisions 16:3 declined 30:21		
25:15,17,20,21,21	/	date 25:8 28:19			
26:3,8,13,16,23	50:19 53:7 54:19	29:7 31:13 35:11	default 16:2,11		
27:2,4,4,9,23,25	courthouse 27:21	35:16,17 38:15,17	19:3 26:9 27:16		
28:4,5,10,12,18	courts 16:4	45:6,22 46:10	27:17 29:4,11,12		
28:22,23 29:4,7	covered 42:22	49:14 51:14 53:2	30:6 31:12 32:14		
29:11,20,22 30:8	53:17	56:4,24 61:25	34:1,5 41:13,14		
30:9,17 31:20,23	covering 41:9	dated 13:8,11	51:19,24,24 52:2		
32:5,8,12,18,21	create 16:14	50:6 53:9	52:4,6,8,11 53:18		
32:22,23,24 33:1	creditor 54:18	dates 57:2	53:25 54:2,2,6,22		
33:5,7,16,19,20	crozier 5:24	day 7:3	54:25 57:7,8,10		
33:23 34:6,16,22	crystal 23:8 28:5	deadline 28:23	57:11		
34:22 35:1,6,10	42:13,25 51:11	40:24 50:17	defaults 14:18		
35:14,15,16,19,21	52:23 53:23	deal 22:25 26:17	15:6 16:1,10,12		
35:23 36:2,4,6,9	cure 14:1 19:10	dealt 9:21 10:4	16:14 17:24 19:6		
36:11,16,21,24	24:25 25:8,17,17	52:17	23:18,19 24:7		
37:3,5,8,10,14,15	25:19 28:23 30:7	debtor 1:10 6:2	25:2,16,19,25		
37:19,24,25 38:1	32:1 36:12 38:13	23:25 24:3 25:13	26:10 30:11,14		
38:8,10,11,25	38:15,16 40:23	25:16 28:14,24	51:13 52:15,19		
39:1,6,9,14,19,19	42:20 48:1 50:16	29:23 35:4,5,9,10	53:16 54:20		
39:21,23 40:2,4	50:23,23,24 51:4	35:22,25 36:1,16	defect 33:24		
40:10,16,19 41:18	51:6,13,24 52:4	37:11 38:22 39:12	defects 24:6		
41:21 42:1,3,6,11	52:13,16 53:3,4	40:19 44:21,24	defendant 23:20		
43:1,5,14,16,17	54:16,17,23,23	45:5,13 50:13	35:7,8,8		
43:19,21,23 44:4	56:4,13,14,15,16	51:2,4,20,20,22	defendant's 3:25		
44:8,9,14,15,16	56:19,20,24,25,25	56:8,10,23	4:5 20:2 24:9		
44:18,21,22 45:2	57:23				
Varitant Lagal Salutions					

[defendants - facts]

efforts 14:8 16:5 46:2,2 48:25,25 17:20 19:17 49:2 **either** 15:12,18 examine 15:25 31:10 42:12 43:6 **examiner** 6:9 8:13 55:10 8:18,23 9:9,12,23 **email** 10:6,13 **example** 39:14 emphasize 14:3 42:19,23 **employ** 16:5 examples 42:14 employed 35:25 exceeds 32:16 **enforce** 3:12 4:6 excellent 27:24 13:22 17:14 19:21 excess 26:1 enforced 25:7 excuse 34:19,23 enforcement 17:5 43:24 58:6 enforcing 50:5 excused 10:18 engendered 32:6 57:1 **enter** 17:11 exercise 27:17 entered 17:6 exhibits 13:13 **entire** 28:17 31:15 47:10 41:19 **exist** 19:4 entirely 27:18 **existed** 47:21,25 32:9 existence 38:12 entirety 20:2 57:3 entities 18:25 **expect** 38:20 43:5 entitled 47:19 expenses 3:6,8 48:9 8:11 express 18:10 **entry** 55:12 essence 54:7 expressed 17:6 essentially 54:11 **expressly** 17:2,13 estopped 17:23 18:12 18:4 30:23 56:23 extensive 8:12 57:9,13 26:20 53:14 estoppel 17:25 **extent** 16:19 30:19 44:13 57:16 17:22 58:5,7 **extra** 38:8 et 1:15 3:11,17,23 f 4:3 **f** 2:1 61:1 **evade** 14:8 17:20 facially 31:6 everybody's 8:24 **fact** 16:9 17:1,24 evidence 18:18 26:19 30:21 37:18 19:3 37:17 40:20 41:6 44:15 exact 37:22 39:4 45:12 53:15 exactly 12:11 facts 18:5 31:1 26:14 27:25 44:8 38:10 47:23

defendants 1:16
3:12,13
deferred 57:23
defined 34:4
definition 32:13
deflect 41:7
deloitte 3:4 6:1
8:2,3,6,6,7,10 9:7
10:6
deloitte's 9:22
denied 23:25 50:7
denying 3:13,25
depends 48:6
deposition 18:21
described 15:19
42:18 54:10
deterioration
34:17,19,19
determination
45:17 57:22
determinations
14:4 34:22,23
determine 54:8
determined 42:21
develop 47:20
developments 9:3
dialed 22:12
23:14
different 30:6
32:9 41:9
directed 44:15
directions 14:13
directive 33:13
directly 33:14
51:15
discovered 12:14
discovery 18:5
47:20 48:9,13,17
discuss 40:10
discussed 25:23
discussion 27:18
dismiss 3:14,25
14:21 15:6,16

18:2,2,9 31:3
50:10 58:2
dismissal 14:6,9
14:11,16 15:3
16:8,9,17 17:4,13
17:15,20 18:1,11
18:20 19:14,20
20:7
dismissed 51:10
dismissing 13:23
dispute 30:7,8
60:2
distinct 18:25
distinction 30:10
34:4
district 1:2 27:21
54:12
doc 4:1
docket 17:19
50:18
doctrine 58:6
document 3:18
documents 13:14
31:6
doing 23:2 25:23
28:1
dollars 51:4
doubt 48:4 58:7
drabs 10:4
drain 2:2 7:2
dribs 10:3
drops 15:13
due 55:7
e
e 2:1,1 5:1,1 7:1,1
61:1
early 34:11
easily 9:17
1

ecf 3:8,14,19 4:1,6

50:21

ecro 2:5

educed 18:5

Page 6

[factual - hold] Page 7

factual 14:4 30:18	25:10 26:5,6	front 57:18,19	grimm 5:3 11:15
31:3 39:24 58:2	33:10 35:23 39:21	frustration 41:20	20:1
fail 25:3 59:18,25	43:14 48:15	further 8:17	grounds 30:10
failed 50:16	finish 33:7	34:16 51:1 58:10	31:9
fails 55:6	fire 40:13 47:24	58:21	guess 21:12 47:8
failure 13:25 32:1	firm 20:16	future 55:7 60:3	55:11
41:10 52:2,7	firm's 26:17	g	h
56:25	first 7:5 8:1,15	g 7:1	hamilton 5:10
fair 32:25 33:2	9:10 12:12 16:10	gaming 27:25	11:11
fall 38:14	17:10 18:23 19:15	garing 27.23 gary 59:18	hampshire 57:14
false 24:6	32:7 50:2 55:11	generated 23:24	handled 11:3
far 30:17 35:11	five 47:8	30:3	hang 10:22 60:7
36:6 39:16 53:1	fix 42:22 53:5	generic 54:2	happened 20:25
56:21,23 58:9	fixed 15:12 43:1	give 41:23 50:2	happening 21:6
february 54:13	flag 54:17	given 9:22 18:8	32:12,21 35:1
federal 50:9 55:15	flat 41:15	26:25 30:14,25	41:20 49:2
55:18	flexibility 54:8	42:3 53:12 54:20	happy 7:18,19
fee 3:4,7 6:9 8:1	floor 6:3	56:12 58:1	25:11 40:14
8:10,12,13,15,16	focus 16:9 18:21	giving 32:21	hard 49:13,18
8:17,19,21,23 9:7	49:10,11	go 7:18,24 15:7	harner 6:9 9:8,9
9:9,12,23	follow 59:25	40:14 46:17,18	10:12,17,21
fees 8:11,15,20	followed 54:21	goes 46:15,22	hear 34:10 44:6
9:1,22	follows 55:3	going 7:24 15:16	59:14,15
fiber 54:14	foregoing 61:3	21:12,14 27:11	heard 22:2,8,14
fifth 5:20	forever 19:6	39:9 49:13 57:14	hearing 3:1,2,4,12
file 13:25 36:12	form 28:25	60:2,7	3:18,24 4:4 7:3
37:17	formal 7:23 9:16	good 7:2,6,21 8:5	11:23 12:15 13:9
filed 3:18 11:21	formally 10:11	9:8 10:14 11:10	15:8 18:9,11
12:4,6 25:17	14:17 16:2 53:19	11:14 20:11,13	24:20 25:24 26:21
52:18 53:3	forth 50:7,25	47:12	29:8,15 31:17
filing 8:16 13:11	53:19 56:17	gotshal 5:18 7:22	43:9 51:7 59:23
25:25	found 19:1	59:17	hearings 7:9,14
final 3:4 8:1,10,13	four 42:14	gottlieb 5:10	59:13
8:16 9:7,13,20	frankly 30:12	11:11	held 21:24 27:7
10:7 19:11 37:5	37:16 38:4 41:7	governed 16:25	34:15,16 54:5
55:12	44:6	grant 9:24 15:16	herring 36:17
finally 17:1 57:5	fraud 18:18 24:16	55:3	49:10,11 56:23
finder 44:15	25:4,11,14,20	granted 50:7	hiding 54:7
finding 30:8,18	44:22 45:5 46:4	granting 3:13,24	hold 20:16 21:22
58:2	56:8,10,21	15:5 58:10	22:8,24 23:13
findings 31:3	friedmann 5:25	gray 21:1,10	28:6 43:23 55:3,7
fine 10:19 11:8	frivolous 54:11	great 29:15	58:14
22:13 23:15 24:16		 	

[holdco - judicial] Page 8

haldaa 1,15 2,11	44.7.47.10	independent 2.6	25.6 26.12 15
holdco 1:15 3:11	44:7 47:19	independent 3:6	25:6 26:13,15
3:17,23 4:3 5:11	honorable 53:11	6:2 8:8 54:24	27:15 28:9,11
11:3	hope 43:25	indicated 35:21	30:2,3,5,18,19,21
holding 19:5	hoping 49:1	indiscernible	30:21 31:21 34:21
holdings 1:8	hot 39:17	21:18 33:6 43:1	36:18 37:18 38:8
holds 16:19	house 8:6	49:19,21	38:9,17 40:5
hon 2:2	housekeeping	indisputably	41:19 43:11 44:2
honor 7:21 8:5,25	11:19	50:24	44:10,10 45:4,6
9:8,18 10:9,15,17	hyde 4:25 61:3,8	inform 54:17	45:24 46:4,16,18
10:20,21,25 11:4	i	information 9:10	46:18,22 47:13
11:10,14 12:3,8	i.e. 15:13 30:23	9:14	48:14 58:7 59:15
12:11,25 13:15,18	40:5 52:12 53:17	initial 7:19 20:5	issues 9:25 33:18
14:10,14 15:2	57:2	initially 23:24	38:18 40:12 44:12
16:11 17:1,8,10	idea 7:6	26:7	44:14 47:25 54:17
17:15,22 18:17		initiates 25:22	60:1
19:11,22,25 20:2	identify 7:4 34:18	ink 56:7	items 34:17
20:20,22 21:20	ignore 17:25	innumerable 24:5	j
22:6 23:2,16,23	47:10	inquiry 41:1	
24:21 25:10,15,18	ignores 34:2,3	inspect 48:19	j 3:19
26:2,5,6,14,22	immediately	instance 32:7	jacqueline 5:23
28:2,8,13,21	53:22	intended 32:17	7:21 10:25
29:10,17,21 30:2	impact 36:2	intent 28:3	jamieson 13:10
30:4,16 31:19,22	implemented	intention 26:9	14:14 22:21 26:18
32:4,9,11,16,25	50:19	interaction 8:12	27:24 31:11 32:19
33:2,3,10,11,14	important 15:21	8:17	41:2,23 48:24
34:13,15,16 35:5	16:10 17:15 25:13	interfere 17:11	53:11 58:19 59:4
35:9,13,20 36:8	imports 59:15	interim 8:15,21	january 13:8,22
36:14,19,20 37:1	impossible 52:4	9:12,21 10:7	22:18 28:20 29:9
' '	improperly 45:13		30:13 31:14 40:22
37:7,9,13,21 38:7 38:23 39:3,8,18	inception 8:9	interpret 17:13 54:4	50:6 53:13 55:4
	include 51:12		55:12 58:13
40:1,9,11,15	includes 27:23	interpretation	jared 5:25
41:16 42:1,5 43:4	32:14 42:25	14:23 15:3 16:8	jennifer 5:24
43:10,12,25 44:5	including 27:20	16:18 17:4,16	joshua 5:8 11:15
44:15,25 45:8,14	inconsistencies	25:7 58:21	20:1 21:21
45:21 46:3,7,11	18:23	interpreted 27:20	judge 2:3 7:2
46:14,21 47:2,12	incorporated 31:6	introduction 7:17	14:14 21:2,17
47:17 48:5,11,21	55:16	introductory	27:21,21,24 41:23
49:1,4,16,23 50:3	incorporating	12:13,19 13:2	54:5,10
58:22,23 59:5,8,9	50:9 55:18	involving 11:2	judgment 54:19
60:4,8	incorrect 55:10	irrelevant 39:17	judicata 36:18
honor's 13:1 23:3	55:13,19	40:20,24 56:22	judicate 36:25
26:12 33:12,17	incurred 3:6	issue 13:7 18:19	judicial 17:25
34:8 35:2 41:20	3.0	20:15,24 22:4,25	30:19,24 31:8
		ral Calutions	20.17,2131.0

[judicial - menlo] Page 9

57:16 58:5	1	lengthier 31:16	loophole 16:14
judicially 17:23	lack 18:18	lengthy 47:9 51:6	lose 20:17
30:23 57:9,13	landlord 14:17,23	letter 13:10 14:14	losses 52:10
jurisdiction 17:12	15:9 16:18 17:9	20:15 22:21,22	lost 20:18 21:2
17:13 30:22 57:22	17:10 19:8,16	26:17 28:7,9,10	30:21 57:20
justice 13:10	22:21 30:14 32:15	30:9 32:7,18,22	lower 16:11
14:14 22:21 26:18	33:25 38:11 43:13	33:11 34:25 38:4	lucky 27:6
27:23 31:11 32:19	44:10 47:22 48:1	41:8 42:4 53:9	luke 5:15 11:10
41:2 48:24 53:10	49:10,12,12 50:15	55:2,4 58:12,12	12:25 13:18 33:4
58:19 59:4	51:15 52:18 53:11	58:16	m
justify 49:14	53:16,19 55:6,8	levander 5:16	maine 57:14
justin 2:5	56:11 57:4 58:14	lexis 54:12	making 25:5
k	58:15	liberty 5:12	30:24 49:17
keep 7:15	landlord's 14:22	lie 14:24 16:5	manges 5:18 7:22
kept 48:18,22	15:2 16:7 18:13	29:12	manifest 41:21
kind 16:5	18:15 53:14 56:15	lied 28:24	marcus 5:23 7:21
knew 25:16,19	56:16,25	light 25:24	7:22 10:25,25
26:9 28:16 35:8,9	landlords 14:23	likelihood 54:20	11:9 59:8,10,12
35:10 36:1,11,15	language 23:6,17	limit 18:10 54:7	59:18 60:4
36:16 37:11,15,19	23:19,21 27:19	linda 53:11	mass 49:6
	34:24 55:20	line 15:8 18:12	
38:11,14,22 39:12	law 11:21 53:23	20:19,21 21:15,22	materially 12:16 20:9
40:20,23 43:12 44:21,24 45:7,25	55:1,14 57:14	22:1,12 30:5 34:3	matter 1:6 7:10
	lawyer 27:10	liquidate 54:22	
46:19,22 48:6,12 48:18 49:10,12,20	laying 10:7	liquidated 15:18	8:1,3 11:1,1,1,19 11:22 20:5 29:4
know 7:25 8:25	lease 15:25 16:1	15:19 42:16,18,24	29:13,24,25 31:1
18:14 23:1,2 31:4	16:10,13,20,24	52:22	33:21 34:15 35:10
31:9,9 34:9 36:16	23:18,19 27:18	listen 59:19	35:11,19 38:22
38:1,1,6,18,22	31:12 41:13 50:11	litany 40:14 49:6	55:13
40:20 41:1 43:6	50:13,20 51:13,20	literally 11:20	matters 3:1 9:17
44:6 48:19,23	51:21,22 52:3,8	26:18 27:15 38:3	35:13,21 36:9,13
49:8,13 57:2	52:10,16,25 53:17	42:15 43:24	mean 13:4 48:17
known 32:14	53:20,25 54:1,3,9	litigation 14:12	mechanics 54:1
33:24 34:9,11	54:19 55:1	53:10 58:16	mechanism 16:1
35:3,4 36:12	leases 23:18	little 22:17	56:4
37:16,19 38:12,15	leave 11:6	llc 1:12,15 3:10,11	mechanisms
38:16 39:12 40:23	led 13:9	3:16,17,19,22,23	16:24,25
41:1,4 42:7,7,9,10	ledanski 4:25 61:3	4:2,3 5:4 11:3,16	memorandum
43:11,12 44:11,11	61:8	13:21 50:5,12	11:21
45:9 46:1,19,22	legal 61:20	llp 3:4 5:10 11:11	menlo 1:12 3:10
47:21,21 48:7,13	legally 55:10	long 19:16	3:16,19,22 4:2 5:4
49:5,5,21 57:3	length 25:23	look 16:17 18:11	11:2,16 13:20
77.3,3,41 37.3	29:15 43:8		50:12
	27.13 73.0		JU.12

[mentioned - order] Page 10

mentioned 9:4	32:7 38:4,21 50:4	56:20,24	omnibus 7:3
merely 25:6 56:15	50:8,15 51:7 53:8	noticed 14:18	59:13
merit 25:5	55:3,9,15,17 58:1	16:2,14 31:12	once 8:23 52:22
metromedia	58:11,11	53:16,19	ongoing 34:17
54:13	mouth 20:3	notices 25:8 57:2	53:5
mind 13:16	moved 59:24	noticing 16:1	operate 52:7
mineola 61:23	mute 7:15	notion 56:8	operating 11:12
minute 31:17	n	notwithstanding	13:20 50:5
minutes 27:11	n 5:1 7:1 61:1	16:22 35:5 52:25	opportunity
mis 56:2	name 7:7 27:21	november 50:18	11:22 19:12
misinformation	nature 51:2	number 11:5	opposed 21:1
45:16	near 60:2	18:12 39:19	opposite 37:22
misinterpreted	necessary 15:13	ny 1:21 5:13,21	opposition 3:18
42:12	31:7	6:4 61:23	17:9 19:20
misinterpreting	necessitated	0	oral 38:3 39:8
40:6	17:19 28:10	o 2:1 7:1 61:1	51:12 52:15 53:14
mislead 44:25	need 10:8,11 24:2	objection 12:2,4	55:23 56:12 57:5
misled 44:19	26:6 38:12,19,19	12:10 13:6,25	order 3:13,24 4:4
misrepresenting	40:16 41:17 48:11	46:9 55:9 56:1,7	7:10 8:22 10:6
40:12	58:9,20 59:17	57:12 59:21 60:2	13:7,8,9,23 14:2,6
mode 59:19	needed 22:3 56:5	obligation 51:1	14:7,9,11,16,20
modest 8:20	needs 55:22	55:21	15:3 16:9,16,17
moment 11:20	neither 18:19	obligations 16:13	16:23,25 17:1,4,5
12:22	network 54:14	52:3 53:6 55:24	17:11,13,14,15,17
monetarily 55:22	never 18:7 22:23	obviously 48:17	17:21 18:1,21
monetary 27:13	53:15,21 55:2	49:5 55:12 58:1	19:14,16,20 20:7
51:1 52:2,5,20	new 1:2 5:13,21	october 8:10	20:9,10,14,14,17
56:2,3	6:4 39:1,4,6 57:14	13:11 22:22 30:9	22:2,3,18,20,23
money 38:13	nj 5:6	53:9 58:11	22:25 23:5,7,7,8
52:18 55:22,25	non 52:2,5 55:1	odds 14:19	23:17,20 25:7
56:3	56:3	office 7:11,12	26:12,15 28:20,25
month 59:16,23	nonresidential	oh 23:4	29:9,15 30:11,12
monthly 59:13	52:7	okay 8:4 9:2,6,19	30:13 31:11,13,14
months 55:12	note 9:14 11:19	10:16,24 12:18,21	31:18 32:16,17
morning 7:2,18	15:21 23:19	13:17 19:24 21:4	33:15,18 34:2,3,8
7:21 8:5 9:9 11:10	noted 8:14 55:3	21:16 22:11,16	35:2 36:12,18,22
11:13,14,17 12:15	55:20	24:14 39:3 43:14	37:6 38:14,21
13:19	notice 3:1 14:1	44:4 46:25 47:15	40:6,21,21,22
motion 3:12,12,13	19:10 25:1,17	49:22 50:3 59:6	41:14 42:15 46:12
3:25 4:5 13:5,7,11	30:14 32:1 33:25	59:12,22 60:4,6	49:24 50:5,6,8,17
13:14,22 14:21	48:1 50:24,25	old 61:21	50:19,22 51:11
15:6,16 18:2,2,8	51:4,6 53:3 54:16	omitted 12:13	52:23 53:13,17
19:17,20 31:3	55:7 56:5,13,15	12.13	55:5,13 56:18,18
	33.7 30.3,13,13		
	Veriteyt Lea	gal Solutions	

[order - procedure]

			_
58:9,10,12,13,18	pecuniary 52:10	please 8:25 10:18	precise 12:12
58:21,23	penalties 24:1	plus 42:20	48:11 49:17
order's 16:8	45:16	podium 19:23	precisely 33:20
ordered 4:4	penalty 52:1,1	point 7:16 18:23	prefer 49:23
orders 15:1 25:8	perfectly 25:22	20:13 22:7 29:23	preference 13:2
53:7,18	41:22	29:25 32:15 33:1	prejudice 3:14
original 20:10	perform 32:3	37:22 38:25 39:1	13:23
23:20 50:15	51:16 52:2	40:8,19,25 43:8	preliminary 9:16
originally 27:2	performance	43:24 47:1,18	preparation
outrageous 26:17	15:10,11 52:9	49:4 53:15 54:16	12:15
31:15 41:12	53:6 55:21	55:11 56:1,3 60:7	prepare 7:23
outside 16:15	performed 8:9	pointed 36:23	58:17
owed 51:2 52:21	performing 52:5	points 39:4 41:16	prepared 11:23
52:22	period 3:7 10:4	55:9	26:17 44:9
owing 15:12,23	36:25 43:3 46:19	position 18:7	prepetition 17:24
25:2 50:11 51:5,8	57:4	22:22 25:1 43:22	presentation 33:8
52:24 53:4 56:16	perjurious 47:3	44:2 56:14,16	presented 33:19
p	perjury 24:1	57:13,17,18,20,21	presiding 53:10
p 5:1,1 7:1	45:16	58:15	pretty 48:19
page 12:12 15:15	permit 54:5	positions 18:24,24	59:19
18:11 20:5 30:4	permitted 11:6	possession 51:20	prevail 57:20
pages 47:9 54:12	perspective 33:17	51:22	prevailed 57:19
paid 51:15	petition 24:11,12	possible 13:16	prevent 14:7
pain 24:1	43:2 57:10	30:22,25	previously 28:15
pains 45:15	phone 11:5	post 27:14 30:5,7	34:9,11 54:6
papers 16:3 17:10	pieces 19:4	31:24 32:2 34:5	55:21
paragraph 16:17	place 51:7	53:5 57:8,22	primarily 8:15,20
20:5 52:12 53:17	plain 14:6 27:19	posture 18:1,8	primary 13:14
park 5:6	34:2 55:20	potential 50:20	50:14
part 3:13,13,24,25	plains 1:21	54:17,20	prior 13:24 14:18
30:7 43:12 50:7,7	plaintiff 1:13	potentially 37:14	16:15 26:10 51:14
particularly 17:3	16:21 17:23 50:12	47:3	53:7,18
17:14	52:18 53:1	pre 15:6,14,17	problem 20:17
parties 14:11	plaintiff's 17:20	16:20 18:15 24:11	21:17 32:5 33:13
51:16 53:8 57:24	18:17 19:3	24:12 27:13 29:16	33:13 38:12
59:24	plaintiffs 24:7	29:23 31:24,25	problems 24:5
partner 59:18	plan 10:22	32:6,14 34:1,4,7	28:15,17
party 57:17	plaza 5:12 6:3	34:12 35:3 39:11	procedural 18:1,8
passed 19:16	pleading 12:5	40:13 42:6,8,17	procedurally
55:16	25:21 27:1 30:20	43:2,3 51:8,12	19:14 27:5 55:10
paul 6:9 9:9	39:16 47:9	53:1,6 57:10,11	procedure 50:9
payment 50:10	pleadings 45:12	precipitated 38:4	54:16,21 55:15,18
52:17 55:25		58:11	
1	1	1	I .

Page 11

procedures 14:2,7	provisions 52:12	reading 14:15,19	regarding 8:3 9:1
14:20 15:1 16:16	purpose 14:21	15:4	regardless 39:12
16:25 17:5,17			42:9 44:23 47:22
*	purposes 35:13 52:16	ready 27:4	48:2 49:20 52:24
30:12 31:13 40:21		reaffirming 43:7	
50:17,22 56:18	pursuant 14:13	real 40:4 52:3,7	regime 54:24
proceed 13:2	17:6	really 11:23 40:6	regimen 54:25
41:24 49:24	pursue 29:16	40:17 41:5,6,12	reimbursement
proceeding 3:10	put 7:7 21:22 22:8	49:12 58:25	3:5
3:16,22 4:1,2 11:2	51:4	reason 42:13 49:7	reinterpretation
13:20 27:1 32:5,8	puts 16:18	49:13 57:1	58:10
32:12,22 35:21,23	q	reasonable 41:1	reject 16:4 54:9
36:3 47:4 49:20	quantified 15:11	reasoned 15:8	relate 8:20
50:6	55:22	recommenced	related 3:18 4:1
proceedings	quarropas 1:20	14:11	8:14 30:4
14:20 58:24 60:10	quarropas 1.20 question 10:3	reconsider 19:13	relating 51:25
61:4	22:16	reconsideration	52:1
production 7:11	questions 9:1	19:15,18	relatively 8:20
prompt 52:13	19:22 27:12	record 12:14,20	relevance 44:18
54:23	quickly 9:15	14:10,20 20:1	44:21
prompted 13:11	23:14	47:20 52:15 58:23	relevant 13:14
promptly 51:23		61:4	37:14 38:24 45:6
55:5 58:14	quite 27:24 30:25 53:12	recording 7:8,12	45:20,23,25 59:20
proof 25:25 42:23		red 36:17 49:10	relief 14:3 19:19
52:18 55:23	quoted 55:21	49:11 56:22	29:1 50:14
proper 56:19	r	reduction 8:14,18	relieve 42:1 46:9
property 24:2,5	r 2:1 5:1 7:1 61:1	9:3 10:2,5	reluctant 17:18
28:16,17 33:24	race 32:10	refer 58:18	relying 56:24
34:7 35:3,24 52:3	raise 26:21 29:25	reference 16:12	remain 14:24
52:8	44:12 54:6	17:2 30:12,13	remaining 60:1
propose 8:24	raised 26:7,19	referenced 14:15	remains 34:20
11:25 13:2	28:12 33:25 38:2	referred 45:12	remarks 7:23
proposed 8:22	39:8 53:15,21	referring 24:10	remedies 27:17
10:6 23:9,20,21	raises 17:9	24:11,12 53:25	rendered 3:5
26:15	raising 26:18	refers 16:9 53:24	repair 52:15
protections 14:25	29:22 36:21 39:1	reflect 9:11 25:20	repairs 15:14
provide 54:23	39:2,6 40:12	reflected 8:19	16:20 24:2 38:23
58:19 59:3	rate 52:1	25:17	51:16
provided 50:22	rationale 15:4,21	reflects 14:10	repeat 22:17
provides 7:12	15:25 27:11	refute 16:23	repeatedly 20:4
51:18,23	rdd 1:3,4 3:10,16	refuted 15:4	27:6
provision 33:25	3:22 4:2	regard 13:7 25:6	reply 13:6 19:23
51:25,25 52:1,13	read 24:24	25:15 28:7 32:23	20:6
52:16,24	readily 12:5	32:24 34:25 40:7	
,			
-			•

[report - sonya] Page 13

	I	I	I
report 7:19	retained 8:7	39:6 45:18	set 25:8 28:23
reported 22:7	retains 17:13	says 23:17 48:18	50:7,17,25 53:2
reporter 7:7	retracted 55:5	sayville 1:12 3:10	53:19 56:17,24
reports 9:16	returned 53:8	3:16,19,22 4:2 5:4	setting 54:1 57:2
representative	review 9:12,23	11:2,16,22 13:3	settle 10:10,11
18:22 24:3,15	11:22	13:20 14:13 19:12	settling 49:24
28:14 35:24,24	reviewed 9:20	19:23 20:2,6	shocked 26:24
representing 8:6	13:5,13	50:12,16,24	shockingly 53:12
request 11:4	revised 7:17 9:25	sayville's 13:5,25	shoot 27:4
17:11 32:7	20:9	14:8	short 8:1
requested 8:11	revisit 19:13	sbc 27:22 54:12	shot 53:22
required 14:1	revisiting 19:19	scheduled 3:1	should've 38:15
16:20 18:3 51:13	rifle 5:5	59:16,23	42:19,20 44:11
57:13	right 7:24 9:19	schedules 10:7,8	55:2 56:11
requires 14:4,5	12:24 13:4 21:25	scheduling 4:4	show 18:14 47:24
20:3 54:24 57:16	22:19 43:17,19	sears 1:8 7:3	shreds 19:2
reread 24:19	46:2,2 48:25 49:3	50:13	sides 20:3
res 36:18,24,25	59:6,22	second 8:21 17:22	signed 3:24 4:5
reservation 52:21	road 5:5 61:21	section 12:12 14:7	8:24
reserve 19:23	robert 2:2	17:2,7 24:24	significance 45:18
resolved 9:17	rockefeller 6:3	27:19 31:16 51:1	47:2
59:16,20	roland 8:2,5	51:18 53:24 55:25	significant 12:22
respect 15:16	role 9:22	see 21:6,14,18	41:21
25:25 44:13,17	ronald 6:6	25:3 42:3 54:13	silent 14:24
45:19 51:9 52:19	room 1:20	seek 19:18 28:25	simple 29:1 38:17
respectfully 25:18	roughly 52:20	seeking 14:4	40:19 58:18
32:11,15	rule 50:8,9 54:4	29:18	simply 15:4 18:19
respond 17:8 33:4	55:15,16,17,18	sees 28:4	19:2 22:20 32:20
responded 56:5,6	ruling 31:17 44:7	send 10:12 59:2	34:21 37:12 42:2
responding 25:8	47:14,19 50:2	sending 55:4	45:12 55:19
56:4	55:6 58:19 59:1	sense 46:23	sir 23:5
response 14:1	run 41:24	sent 41:8 50:24	sits 27:21
19:9 25:22 32:1	S	53:11 55:2	situation 23:24
48:1 50:23 51:5		sentence 12:12,13	six 19:14
53:3 56:15,20	s 3:18 5:1 7:1	12:19	slack 27:10
responsibility	s.d.n.y. 54:13,14	separate 41:6	sole 16:21
16:21 34:20 52:25	safe 43:7	45:2	solution 23:9,10
responsive 9:15	samuel 5:16	septic 30:4,17	solutions 7:9,12
rest 16:18 23:11	sanction 22:24	38:9 40:7 47:24	20:23 21:21 22:7
33:7	sanctions 46:5	57:7	61:20
result 22:20	satisfaction 51:25	serves 16:13	solve 20:17
resulting 52:10	saw 11:20	services 3:5 8:9	sonya 4:25 61:3,8
	saying 26:16	9:22	,
	32:10 37:5,10		
Veritext Legal Solutions			

[sorry - totally] Page 14

sorry 21:20 27:3	status 59:25	sure 11:8 12:14	text 16:8
28:2 39:18 57:10	statute 55:20	20:23,25 21:8	thank 9:18 10:9
sort 7:19 10:3	steen 5:10 11:11	47:7 59:2	10:14,16,20,21,22
sorts 56:18	stipulation 4:4	system 40:13	11:9 12:22 19:25
sought 9:25 50:10	stop 36:21 37:5	47:25	21:16 23:12,16
50:14	39:2	t	33:10 41:17 60:5
sound 15:13	stores 11:12 13:21	t 61:1,1	60:6,7,8
source 16:13	50:5	tactic 16:6	thing 22:2 59:1
southern 1:2	street 1:20	take 7:19 22:23	things 12:10
speak 7:5,15	structure 14:22	25:12 30:22 48:9	25:24 40:15 57:16
specific 15:10,10	subject 13:1 31:13	58:15	think 10:4 13:10
37:18 52:24 54:23	32:18 38:3	taken 7:9 22:22	20:13,18 21:2
specifically 14:17	submit 8:25 25:18	43:22 48:13	23:10 25:12 27:6
14:22 16:4,19,23	32:16 33:11	takes 31:5 44:1	27:9 31:20 34:2
18:21 24:24 30:3	submitted 23:25	talk 20:3	36:2 39:3,4,5
40:7 45:1	24:6,13 25:19	talking 38:18	41:21,21 43:23
specified 40:7	35:6,22 44:13	tank 30:4,17 38:9	47:13 49:13 58:18
specify 16:13	45:15 47:3	40:7 47:24 57:7	58:20 59:18,19
specifying 56:9	submitting 20:8	teed 60:2	third 8:21 18:17
speck 27:15	47:9	telecom 27:22	51:16
spent 27:10 56:7	subsequent 8:16	54:12	thought 23:13
standard 17:25	subsumed 10:1	telephonic 3:2 7:4	59:15,22
49:5	successor 19:1	7:14	time 7:5 14:10
state 14:12 17:12	suddenly 32:10	telephonically 5:8	15:9 19:15 25:9
17:21 24:1,11,13	suggest 18:6	5:15,16 6:8	26:3 28:17 29:22
25:11,12 26:8	58:23	tell 12:5	30:1 32:15 35:5
28:9 32:5,8,12,22	suggestion 16:23	telling 21:21 38:5	51:21 52:5,9
32:23 33:16,19,23	19:11	39:16 46:3	55:14 58:4 59:13
34:6,16,22 35:1	suggests 19:8	tenant 51:15,16	59:14
35:15,21,23 36:2	26:15	term 16:11 33:22	timely 19:6,17
37:15,19,25 38:11	suite 61:22	34:4 54:2	29:5 41:11 50:23
38:24 39:9,19	summary 9:11	terms 14:6,19	51:5 54:22 56:19
41:18,20 42:6	sunday 19:14	15:25 16:23,24	times 24:23
43:16,22 44:8,9	supersedes 54:25	17:6 18:19,20	timing 30:6
44:14,15 45:15,17	supplemental	19:19 20:9 30:6	tobay 6:10
45:19 46:15,16	11:21	34:2 49:4,24	today 7:24 27:7
47:3,4 49:2,17,19	support 19:3	testified 24:4	32:19 58:24
53:8,10 56:21	supports 16:8	28:16 34:13	today's 7:8 13:14
57:24 58:12,16	19:7	testifying 24:3	59:10
stated 30:4 53:21	suppose 30:23	28:14 35:25 36:1	told 24:25
statement 30:20	suppression 40:13	testimony 19:2,4	tort 49:6
states 1:1,19	47:24	19:7	totally 21:10 56:2
22:20 29:9			

[touche - zero] Page 15

touche 3:4 6:1 8:2	u	untenable 14:15	whatsoever 25:5
8:7,7,11	u.s. 2:3 54:12	untimely 19:19	white 1:21
transcribed 4:25	57:14	use 19:12	win 30:20
transcript 7:10	ultimately 42:18	utterly 31:15	wish 58:20
13:8 15:7 18:11	42:21 47:24 52:22	V	withdraw 28:6,9
24:19 30:5 31:17	54:18 56:17	v 1:14 3:10,16,22	33:12
42:13,15 43:8	unambiguous	4:2 13:20 54:11	withdrawn 20:16
58:20 59:2 61:4	20:7,12,14 22:5,6	57:14	58:15 59:21
transcripts 47:10	22:18 33:18	vacated 55:14	withdraws 22:21
transform 1:15	unasserted 15:6	vacateu 33.14 various 9:12,16	withstanding
3:11,17,23 4:3	undefined 16:11	various 9.12,10 vast 9:21	31:11
5:11 11:3,12,19			witness 18:22
13:1,20,23,25	underlying 13:6	veritext 61:20	34:12
14:4 17:11,18,23	undermine 17:20 33:20	version 12:4	woodland 5:6
18:3,13,22,25,25	understand 28:18	view 13:13	work 10:1 57:24
20:7,8 24:4 28:15		violation 55:4	world 59:14
30:20,23 32:3,5,8	29:6,10,17 32:4	58:13	would've 41:13
33:19 34:18,21	32:20 35:12,18,20	voice 7:7	42:19 49:18 53:18
36:1 37:23 40:5	36:8,10,19,20,24	W	53:22
44:1 47:19 50:4	37:1 43:4,10 44:7	wait 14:24 16:5	wrong 30:15 34:7
50:11,12,15,21	45:8,21,23 47:7	21:13	35:2 36:2 37:12
51:3 57:7,9,12,20	47:14	walker 2:5	41:15
59:9	understandably	wander 59:14	X
transform's 13:5	17:18	want 7:9 14:3	
13:6,22 19:8 50:8	understanding	23:7 34:9 42:11	x 1:5,11,17 42:20
58:4	58:4	42:12 43:20 44:6	y
tried 21:5	understood 13:15	47:17 59:13	yeah 21:10,12
true 18:4 31:5	48:10,10	wanted 11:19	30:13
44:1 61:4	unexpired 51:19	12:16 59:14	years 35:3
truly 32:2	52:3 53:25	wants 7:20	york 1:2 5:13,21
trustee 51:20,22	unfortunately	waste 25:9 26:3	6:4
51:23 52:4	39:22	way 28:4 37:16	young 6:6 8:2,5,6
truth 38:6	unfounded 26:24	40:6 41:7 56:10	9:5,14 10:9,14,22
try 13:16 21:8	41:11	ways 19:14	young's 9:10
trying 41:10	united 1:1,19	we've 38:9 39:4	Z
turn 13:3 15:25	unknown 32:14	39:18 41:22 44:8	
turned 15:22	33:24	weeds 54:7	zero 25:17,20
turning 16:7	unliquidated	weigh 39:23,25	51:4
two 40:25 41:16	15:13	40:1	
typos 12:9 59:3	unmute 7:16 21:5	weight 25:5	
Upos 12.7 37.3	unmuted 21:9	weil 5:18 7:22	
	unopposed 9:25	11:5 59:17	
	unproper 19:14	went 15:15 29:14	
		10.10 27.11	